AN Impartial Account OF THE Portsmouth DISPUTATION.

With some Just *REFLECTIONS* on Dr. *RUSSEL*'s Pretended Narrative.

By { *Samuel Chandler*, *William Leigh*, *Benjamin Robinson*.

With an Abridgment of those Discourses that were the Innocent Occasion of that Disputation.

LONDON:

Printed for *John Lawrence* at the *Angel* in the *Poultry*, and *Abraham Chandler* over-against the *White Hart-Inn* in *Aldersgate-Street*; and are to be Sold by *A. Baldwin* at the *Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane*. 1699.

To the Honourable Major General Earl, *Governor*; *Colonel* John Gibſon, *Lieutenant Governor*, *of His Majeſties Gariſon of* Portſmouth: *and the Worſhipful* Henry Seager, *Eſq*; Mayor *of* Portſmouth.

Honourable Sirs,

WITH Hearts full of Loyalty and Thankfulneſs to our Rightful Sovereign King *William*, we humbly lay theſe Papers at your Feet, who procur'd for us a Grant from his Majeſty, publickly to vindicate the Common Cauſe of the Reformed Churches, and ſettle the wavering among us in the belief and practice of thoſe truths, which tend very much to the advancement of Early Piety and Religion.

We appeal to you, the Honourable Governour and Worſhipful Mayor, as to Diſintereſted Perſons, and moſt proper Judges of the Truth and Impartiality of our Account; which is, what was taken by the Pens of the Scribes, without any material alteration. We thankfully acknowledge your Condeſcending

Goodneſs, in Honouring us with your preſence and preventing diſorders, during the time of diſputation.

May you ſtill continue maintainers of Juſtice and diſcipline in your reſpective Poſts: May your Names be tranſmitted to Poſterity, as Glorious Reformers of a corrupt and degenerate Age, in conformity to the Injunctions and Example of our Gracious King: May others be excited and influenc'd by your Example: May theſe hopeful beginnings be carry'd on, that there may be no prophane Swearers or Debauchees in your Streets, and Vice and Wickedneſs may be put out of Countenance and not able to ſhew its Head: This is, and ſhall be the conſtant Prayer of,

Your Honours

Oblig'd Humble Servant,

SAMUEL CHANDLER

To all the Pious and Sober amongst them that deny, or doubt of Infant Baptism.

Brethren in our Lord,

THE matters in difference betwixt you and us, are not so great, as the angry and uncharitable on either side wou'd make 'em seem; there may be some (we doubt not) both with us and you, that do Hereticate and Damn each other on the Account of their disagreeing Judgments about *Baptism*: (Nor is it to be wonder'd at, if those who are strangers to all serious Religion, should put the respective differing Opinions in the place and stead of it:) But we were willing here to let the World see, there are with us, and (we Charitably hope) with you also, those that are both of a sounder Judgment and of a much better Spirit.

We are perswaded, there are many amongst you, who (tho you do dissent from us in some lesser matters, yet) are agreed with us in the most important and concerning things. Wherever there are real Christians on both sides, in any Controversie, (as we make no question but there are in this) it is most certain, the things wherein they are agreed, are greater, far greater, than any wherein they can differ. When all the great substantials of Christianity are out of doubt, both with you and us, that which shall afterwards remain as a disagreed, or doubted thing on either side, must needs be Comparatively very small, and not worthy of the Heat and Zeal too commonly laid out upon it.

And we must profess for our own parts, (tho wherein we differ from you, we are verily perswaded, the truth is

on our side, yet reckoning it to be only truth of an inferior Nature) it has not been without regret, that we have been engag'd in this Contention. The *Disputation* it self was not what we sought, or was forward to; it was not we that gave the Challenge: Nor when given, would we have accepted it, had it not been so circumstanc'd, as that our refusal wou'd most probably have redounded to the detriment and dishonour of what we believe to be the Truth: Many, especially the more injudicious part of the Auditory, before whom the Challenge was given, not being likely to judge otherwise, than that what we maintain wou'd not bear a publick hearing, shou'd we have declin'd a *Disputation*, which we were so publickly provok'd to.

And for this *Publication* of it, 'tis what we are alike passive in: The World shou'd have had no after-trouble about that *Disputation*, might we have been the choosers: But since your Dr. *Russel* has abus'd the World with a most false and unfair Account of that matter; we are necessitated in our own defence, as well as that of the Truth, to Publish the ensuing Papers. We wou'd not therefore, that either what was said by us at the *Disputation*, or is further added in these our *Reflections* shou'd be misunderstood by you: This is not work that we take pleasure in, but what we have been constrain'd to: And if any Reflections shou'd occur that may seem too severe; we wou'd here declare, they proceed not from displeasure against the whole Body of those whose sentiments agree with yours, nor against any one barely for that reason: But we cou'd not but manifest a just indignation against the Egregious falsehood and uncharitableness of him that publish'd the late (pretended) *Narrative*: And we desire, that no one of the Pious and Sober amongst you, wou'd apply to your selves, what was only intended as a Rebuke to him, or those who are too like him. Nor will the rest of you (we hope) take it ill from us, that we expose, as it deserves, that which is so base, tho' it be found with a Person that pretends, in the present Controversie, to fall in with you. You will not, you cannot once imagine, that his Concurrence with you in this Point of Baptism, will hallow or excuse all that *deceit* and *falsehood* that appears in him: Nor can you your

selves

ſelves like it, that he ſhou'd endeavour to ſupport your cauſe with lies.

This being premis'd, we are in hopes, the following Papers, if they ſhou'd do no *good* amongſt you, may at leaſt be look'd into without doing *hurt*. So far as they report *matters of fact*, we can boldly, and without fear of being put to ſhame, appeal to the *All-knowing God*, and to the Numerous *Aſſembly*, who were Witneſſes, that they are undiſguiſed *Truths*: And ſo far as they contain *Matters of Opinion* on one ſide or other, we leave you and all others to judge for themſelves.

Yet (as we have already intimated) we wou'd not that the matters contended about in theſe Papers, ſhou'd be over-magnified on either ſide: Or that it ſhou'd be ſuppos'd we differ further than we do: And 'tis a much greater pleaſure to us, to offer any thing that may tend to *narrow* and *leſſen*, than to *Enhance* the differences there are betwixt you and us. After we had been tir'd with an unpleaſing contention, we therefore (as a refreſhment to our ſelves) undertook this more delightful ſervice; here to attempt, ſo far as may be, (notwithſtanding little differences) to reconcile, and bring nearer to each other the Pious and Sober on both ſides. To which end we ſhall, *firſt*, mention to you how far, and wherein we apprehend we are agreed: And thence manifeſt in the *ſecond* place, how inconſiderable the things are, about which we differ.

I. We are agreed, (without doubt) in every thing that is of abſolute neceſſity to ſalvation: This is as certain as that there are *Chriſtians* (that are truly ſuch) on both ſides; that there are thoſe *that ſhall be ſav'd* on both ſides: Nothing that does *Eſſentially* conſtitute *Chriſtianity* is controverted betwixt us: And even with reference to this very point of *Baptiſm*, we are verily perſwaded, there is a nearer agreement betwixt the truly Pious and Serious on both ſides, than is commonly conſider'd. Particularly,

(1.) It is, it muſt needs be agreed by all ſuch, that there is no poſſibility of ſalvation, for any Soul in our Apoſtate World, but only in and thro' Chriſt, *Act.* 4. 12.

(2.) 'Tis alſo agreed, that the Covenant of Grace does fix the terms, upon which Chriſt will be a Saviour to any: That thence only it is to be known, whom he will ſave, and whom he will not be a Saviour to.

(3.) 'Tis also undeniably plain, and what cannot but be agreed amongst us, that according to the Constitution of that Covenant, Christ will be the Saviour of none, but such as are *sincerely devoted* to God: He never was, nor will he ever be the Saviour of any others; but such he has always been a Saviour to, *Jer.* 31. 33. *Psal.* 119. 38. *Heb* 7. 25. Upon these Principles it is, that every serious Soul does devote it self to God in hope. And we doubt not, but you are also agreed with us,

(4.) That such who are Sollicitous about their own salvation, cannot be unconcern'd about the State of their *Infants*. Every Pious Parent will (under the apprehension of that Guilt and Corruption which they inherit with their Nature) with enlarged Affections yearn over their tender little ones, and earnestly cry to God for 'em, and gladly lay hold upon any word of hope concerning 'em. Those amongst you who are Parents, feel and know what is the heart of a Parent towards its Child: And however you are (as all that are truly Christians are) unfeignedly concern'd for, and desirous to promote the *common salvation*; yet for your *Infants*, that are so near you, that are (as it were) parts of your selves, you feel yet another kind of concern: You cannot with any satisfaction die from 'em; you can't, when they are dying, part with 'em, unless you have some ground of hope concerning 'em. Nor can any thing afford you Encouragement to hope, without some word of Promise. Nor is there any word of Promise, only to such as are devoted to God and in Covenant with him, in and thro' Christ: To be *without Christ, without hope, and without God in the World*, is represented as the Case of such as are *out of Covenant* with him, strangers to his Covenant, *Eph.* 2. 12. Wherefore,

(5.) We doubt not but you are also agreed with us, that we should *do all that in us lies*, that our Infants may be in Covenant with God: You do desire (as well as we) that they may be so; and we are perswaded, you will do whatever you are satisfy'd is your Duty, in order to it. You will (nay, we doubt not but you do) pray earnestly for 'em; and plead his Promise with him, *that he will be your God, and the God of your Seed*; and depending upon this promise, you do actually surrender and devote 'em

to him; and look upon your ſelves as oblig'd to educate and train 'em up for him, *&c.* This is what thoſe that are ſeriouſly Religious amongſt you, do, and dare not but do: Nor is any part of this a Controverſie betwixt you and us. Now here is the internal and moſt excellent part of *Baptiſm*, in which we are agreed.---After which, 'tis ſomewhat to be wonder'd at, that there ſhou'd be any remaining difference, as to this matter: However, that which can after ſuch Agreements remain a Controverſie, muſt needs be concluded to be of an inferior and leſs concerning Nature. Which we now therefore come to ſpeak to.

II. The things in which we differ (from what has been already ſaid) appear to be no fundamental ones: Which will alſo yet farther be manifeſted, if the things themſelves be particularly conſider'd. That which is the Subject of the enſuing Papers, and which is commonly agitated betwixt you and us, may be reduc'd to theſe two heads, *viz.* (1.) Whether we may, and ought to *devote our Infants to God in the Ordinance of Baptiſm*? And, (2.) Whether in the Adminiſtration of it, we be oblig'd to *dip the Perſon wholly under Water*? As to both which, it muſt be own'd, we are yet diſagreed: You judging the Ordinance of Baptiſm, which we apply to *Infants*, not to belong to 'em: And while we apprehend *ſprinkling* it ſelf, eſpecially *pouring* a little *water* upon the Face of a Perſon, or *dipping his Face alone in water*, to be Lawful in the Adminiſtration of this Ordinance; you ſuppoſe we are oblig'd to *dip*, or plunge the Perſon *wholly* into water. And while there is a difference in our apprehenſions, it muſt alſo be concluded, that on one ſide or the other, there is certainly a miſtake: *But* tho' there be a miſtake, ſuppoſe it to be on your ſide, or on our's, 'tis far from being a damning one.

1. We will firſt (as we think we have juſt reaſon) ſuppoſe the miſtake to be with you; yet we dare not, nor do Account it a fatal, or undoing one. Thoſe of your way, that agree with us as above (and all the Pious and Sober part of you, we take it, for granted, do) do only differ from us in a Circumſtance. You agree with us, that your *Infants* are to be enter'd into Covenant with God in Chriſt, and ſeriouſly devoted to him, *&c.* You only

ly doubt, whether it may be done in *this Ordinance*: Now tho we are perſwaded, that they ſhou'd not only be enter'd into Covenant, but alſo that this ſolemnity of *Baptiſm* ſhou'd Accompany, and add force to the ſurrender we make of 'em to God; Yet we do not Account it ſo abſolutely neceſſary, as if the ſalvation either of the Parent or Child were ſuſpended on it. We read indeed that *Baptiſm ſaves us*, 1 Pet. 3. 21. But the Apoſtle to prevent miſtake, immediately explains himſelf, and tells us, he does not intend it of the External Ceremony, but of the *Anſwer of a good Conſcience*: Our unfeigned conſent to the *Baptiſmal Covenant* for our ſelves, and for thoſe that we have Power to conſent, and accept it for; and our ſincere devoting our ſelves and them in that Covenant to God in Chriſt, is indeed neceſſary to theirs, and to our own ſalvation; and this is that *Anſwer of a good Conſcience*, which the Apoſtle calls for: But where this is found, tho' the External Ceremony ſhou'd be omitted (whether thro' the miſtake of the Parent, or thro' the abſence of a Miniſter) we don't think God will, nor are we any of thoſe who dare, paſs a ſentence of Death in ſuch a Caſe.

And for the point of *dipping*, we reckon it to be yet much leſs material: The *neceſſity of it* we do indeed oppoſe; and doubt not but the Ordinance of *Baptiſm* (ſo far as concerns this Controverſie) is Lawfully Adminiſter'd, if water be apply'd to a Perſon, in *any other way* or manner; ſo it be done with the awful and ſolemn mention of the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: But yet, ſuppoſing it be ſo order'd, that the *Life* of the Perſon be not hazarded by it; nor any breach maſe upon the Rules of modeſty, we do not Condemn the Practice of *Dipping*: And in thoſe two Caſes, all that are truly Pious amongſt your ſelves, muſt (upon deliberation) needs diſallow it, as well as we.

2. And now we will ſuppoſe the miſtake to be on our part: We make no difficulty of it, to own that we are fallible: As wiſe and good Men as we are, nay, far wiſer and better than we, have been miſtaken; and 'tis no wonder if in many things we be ſo; Nay, we doubt not, but in ſome things at leaſt, we are ſo, becauſe we are Men: Tho' we do not know, that in any Principle of Religion we are ſo, for that we dare not knowingly Err: Wherein ſo-

ever

ever we are convinc'd of a miſtake, we do, and we are willing to retract it: But we may be in an errour, and may not know it: And we will for a while *ſuppoſe* (tho' we have never yet ſeen reaſon to *grant*) that, as to the matters in difference betwixt you and us, we are under a miſtake: Yet neither can the miſtake on our ſide endanger the Foundations, ſuppoſing we ſhou'd be miſtaken. For,

As to the Point of *Infant-Baptiſm*, if it ſhou'd prove to be a miſtake, 'tis only a *Circumſtantial* one, a miſtake as to the *time* of Adminiſtration: This is the worſt that can be made of it, if we ſhou'd be miſtaken: And where is the damage, ſuppoſing we ſhou'd be *too early* laid under the moſt ſolemn Bonds to be the Lords? Tho' by the way, we ſee not how *this* can be done *too ſoon*. We do not, we dare not reſt upon our having been baptiz'd in Infancy, as if that wou'd of it ſelf ſave us: We do indeed reckon it to be *Valid Baptiſm*, and that we do not need to be *Baptiz'd again*, when we become Adult; but we don't think our *Infant-Baptiſm* will ſtand inſtead of *Regeneration*, or exempt us from the neceſſity of Faith, Repentance, or a life of ſerious Holineſs, when we are Adult; Nay, we look upon our ſelves (by Vertue of that Baptiſm) to lie under unalterable Bonds and Obligations hereunto. And now, tho' it ſhou'd be ſuppos'd, we are under a miſtake, as to the *time*, when this Ordinance ſhou'd be Adminiſtred, yet can it have no hurtful influence upon us, or upon any of thoſe great, and important Principles of Chriſtianity in which we are agreed.

Or again, if you ſuppoſe us alſo miſtaken as to the *manner of application*, while we do not (as you) *dip*, or plunge the Perſon baptiz'd wholly under water, but only apply a ſmall quantity of water to 'em, moſt commonly by *Pouring* it upon their Faces: Yet neither can this ſurely, (if a miſtake) be by you Accounted a very dangerous one: No part of ſerious Religion can be thought to be endanger'd by it. The Kingdom of Chriſt does not conſiſt in *Dipping*; ſo as that he that is *Dipp'd* ſhall be ſav'd, and he that is *not Dipp'd* ſhall be Damn'd: You your ſelves dare not lay ſo great a ſtreſs upon it. What! Shall a Soul that is truly Penitent, and with ſerious Actings of Faith and Love, gives up it ſelf to God in Chriſt, a Soul that reſolvedly lies at his Foot, that will not wickedly depart from him; Can you think ſuch a Soul ſhall yet be rejected by him, meerly becauſe in their Baptiſm they were not *Dipp'd* under water! This is what upon ſerious deliberation, we are perſwaded, none of you dare avow.

III. Now then, ſince it appears, that the matters in conteſt betwixt you and us (at leaſt amongſt the Pious and Sober on both

both ſides) are ſo inconſiderable and comparatively ſmall; we wou'd make it the matter of our earneſt requeſt to you, that they may accordingly be own'd and look'd upon by you, do not enhance or over-rate the Value of 'em: By this means, a happy mutual agreement might moſt probably be effected, however all the ill effects of our remaining diſagreements wou'd be prevented or remov'd. (1.) No way more likely than this to promote an *Agreement* amongſt us: Apprehenſions that the differences are greater, and the miſtakes more dangerous than they are, do naturally influence both ſides to look with ſtrangeneſs upon each other, and prejudice 'em againſt what is, or may be offer'd on either ſide: But were it rightly conſider'd, how little the difference is, it wou'd yet tend to make it leſs; by ſoftening minds on each ſide, and preparing 'em with greater impartiality to entertain whatever convincing evidence is laid before 'em. Or, (2.) If it wou'd not remove our differences themſelves, it wou'd (at leaſt) prevent all the ill effects of 'em: For inſtance, why might we not love, and live like Chriſtians (notwithſtanding the remaining differences in our Opinions)? Why might we not pray with, and for each other? Why might we not, according to the Rule of the Goſpel, look favourably upon each others miſtakes, and receive each other to *Love* and *Communion*, avoiding doubtful diſputations, *Rom.* 14. throughout the Chapter. We ſolemnly declare, we are ready thus to receive you; we dare not but receive all whom we are perſwaded, our Lord himſelf will receive: Let there not be a breach maintain'd on your Part, while we impoſe no ſinful, or ſo much as ſuſpected Term of Communion on you. Or, ſuppoſing upon one or other miſtake, you ſhou'd think fit to ſeparate your ſelves from us, from our Aſſemblies, yet, at leaſt, we beg, you wou'd in your diſtinct Aſſemblies ſee to it, that the great and uncontroverted Principles of Chriſtianity may be ordinarily, and with greateſt warmth and earneſtneſs inſiſted on; and let not your Heat and Zeal be laid out upon the little things in which we differ: Let your endeavours be rather to make Men *Chriſtians*, than to make 'em *Antipædobaptiſts*; and ſhew that you prefer the intereſts of our common Lord, before thoſe of your particular Party. For a cloſe, we would leave thoſe Words of the Apoſtle with you, *Phil.* 3. 15, 16. *Nevertheleſs, whereto we have already attain'd, let us walk by the ſame Rule, let us mind the ſame things: And if in any thing ye be otherwiſe-minded, God will reveal even this unto you.*

B. Robinſon,
S. Chandler,
W. Leigh.

AN INTRODUCTION.

MUST I again, be call'd out to engage in this irkſome and unpleaſing Controverſy? Who had much rather ſpend my time in healing differences, and provoking all Chriſtians to love one another. I have often read with ſome pleaſing ſatisfaction, thoſe Expreſſions of Arch-Biſhop Tillotſon, *(that Great Good Man, and National loſs.)* I know not (ſays he) whether St. *Paul*, who had been taken up into the third Heavens, did by that Queſtion of his; *Where is the Diſputer of this World?* Intend to inſinuate that this wrangling work hath place only in this World, and upon this Earth, where only there is a duſt to be raiſed; but will have no place in the other. But whether St. *Paul* intended this or not, the thing it ſelf I think is true, that in the other World all things will be clear and paſt diſpute; to be ſure among the Bleſſed, and probably alſo among the miſerable, unleſs fierce and furious Contentions, with great heat, without light, about things of no moment and concernment to them, ſhould be deſign'd for a part of their torment. *I had much rather be dreſſing my own Soul for Eternity, and preparing others for thoſe calm and peaceable Regions, where perfect Charity and Good will Reign for ever: Than in fomenting and increaſing thoſe Diviſions among Coriſtians, which are too unmeaſurably wide already.*

Tillotſon, *Preſ. to ſix Ser. on family Religion*, pag. 31.

My Charity is not confin'd to any particular Sect, or Party of Chriſtians; but I bear a hearty good will to all that agree in the Eſſentials of Religion, Notwithſtanding their diſtant

distant Opinions, in matters of an inferior Nature. A reform'd Catholick Christian, is a Name that pleaseth me better, than any of those distinguishing Titles which the Contentions of Men have occasion'd in the Christian Church. Tho' I was urg'd by many serious Christians, before the disputation, to Print my Sermons on this subject, which were manag'd rather in a Practical than Controversal way; Yet so averse was I to foment or Increase differences, that I willingly forbore. And if Dr. Russel *had only Printed the Imperfect Notes of his own* Scribes, *perhaps we should still have been silent; and left the World to judge between us: but seeing he hath been guilty of so many Notorious Falsehoods and Misrepresentations, both on his side and ours, we are unavoidably constrain'd to Vindicate the Truths of Christ, the common cause of the reformed Churches, and our own Reputation, against the bold insolence of a Scandalous Libeller:*

The true occasion of my being engag'd in this matter is this: I was invited some years ago, before any Anabaptist *Meeting was set up at* Gosport, *to Preach a Lecture once a fortnight at* Portsmouth; *which I have continu'd (I bless God with no small success) ever since. In the course of my Lecture, I thought it most adviseable to give my hearers a true and orderly Scheme of the Christian Religion. Having therefore explain'd the Creed and Lords Prayer (Mr.* Williams *undertaking the Ten Commandments) I did without any importunity from others, but purely in the method I had laid down, explain the Doctrine of the Sacraments: Here I largely explain'd the Nature of Baptism, and could not do right to my subject, without defending our own practice as to Infants right, and the way of Administration. Dr.* Russel *himself knows how falsely he hath Publish'd to the World, that I inveigh'd against the Poor* Baptists (*as he calls them*) *with most severe Reflections: Seeing he hath read those Notes which Mr.* Ring *took of my Sermons. The very hardest expression in those Notes, is the Title of mistaken Brethren. These Sermons Mr.* Samuel Ring, *who, tho' of that perswasion, usually attends our Lecture, pen'd down in short hand, and afterwards wrote out at length; with an Innocent design (as he himself professeth) to shew them to some of his Brethren.* Farmer Bows, *a pre-*

tended

tended Messenger of the Churches, hearing of this, applies himself to Mr. Ring *for a sight of these Sermons, and having read them, us'd words to this effect. Shall we bear this? If we suffer Mr.* Chandler *thus to go on, it will prejudice our cause. Mr.* Ring *reply'd, Mr.* Chandler *takes but the same liberty in his own Congregation, to defend his own practice, that we do in ours.*

But this was not satisfactory. Mr. Bows *goes over to* Gosport, *to Mr.* John Webber, *Pastor of a Congregation of particular* Anabaptists, *as they are call'd, opposite in their Judgments, in many great points of* Religion, *to those in* Portsmouth. *Mr.* Webber (*as he told me himself*) *was willing to live in Peace, and did not desire to be engag'd: But Mr.* Leddel, *and some others, Men of heat without light, were very urgent, and willing even to accept of* Matthew Caffen *for their Champion, whom Mr.* Bows *propos'd: A Man that denies both the Divinity and Humanity of Christ, and is justly protested against, by many of his Brethren, and particularly by Dr.* Russel. *Mr.* Webber *justly refus'd to own* Matthew Caffen *as a Christian, or a Brother. And therefore, since they would have a dispute, rather propos'd Dr.* Russel. *Accordingly,* December 21. 98. *Mr.* Bows, *Mr.* Webber, *and about twenty of their Party came to my Lecture boldly to confront me, when I was Answering the* Anabaptists *Objections. At the Conclusion,* Farmer Bows *stands up, and in the Name of the rest Challenges me with Preaching Doctrines false and wholly untrue, and desir'd I would admit of a publick dispute with an ordain'd Minister of the Gospel. This bold Challenge I accepted, provided they would procure a Man that understood the regular Laws of disputation, and preliminaries were first settled. Accordingly the next Day, Preliminaries were settled and Papers interchang'd, between* Thomas Bows *and* William Leddel, *as asserters of the two Questions on the one part: And* Francis Williams, *and* Samuel Chandler, *as deniers of the two Questions on the other Part. This Dr.* Russel *perfectly conceals, in his Account of the Preliminaries,* pag. 4. *Because it would have confuted his slander upon the Learned Dr.* Smith, *as if he design'd, by saying, he that asserts must prove, that the Proof lay upon us; but this is Accounted for elsewhere. Mr.* Webber *afterwards*

wards declares his utter dislike of the dispute, and wish'd it had never been: And before my self and Mr. Smith, *deny'd that the Letter in the Name of the Church at* Gosport, Narr. p. 2. *was wrote with his Knowledg or consent. Therefore we Impute not the Falshood of the matter, as if Mr.* Chandler *had inveigh'd against and ridicul'd their Practice; nor the false Grammar in that Letter to him. Mr.* Ring *express'd his hearty sorrow by Letter (as well as otherwise) in these following words — (after having sent me the notes of my Sermons, and deliverd a Copy of the Disputation to Mr.* Smith.) — *I am troubled at the Sad Effects of the Disputation. I mean the difference it hath rais'd among those, that I hope are all the People of God: And the Grief it may have occasion'd to any of his faithfull Ministers: And most of all that I have contributed any thing towards it: Tho' it hath been by accident and no otherwise: and as I pray God forgive me, so I beg your pardon, and crave a share in your Prayers. I always respected you, as a Minister of Christ Jesus; have pray'd for the Success of your Ministry, and have heard you with a great deal of Satisfaction, and I hope have profited by it; and shall continue to do so, and so attend your Ministry without the least Prejudice, and I hope with better Success than formerly. I am,* Sir, *yours in all Christian Service.* Samuel Ring. Portsmouth, May 29. 99.

This is the true Copy of Mr. Ring's *Letter to me, who according to his promise usually attends our Lecture at* Portsmouth, *Now let the World Judg whether my Prejudice against the growth of the Church at* Gosport, *could put me upon this work; or whether I ever inveigh'd against them; many of them can testify to the contrary, to whom I have, and shall bear an hearty love and good will; own them as excellent Servants of Christ, and be very willing to contribute my Assistance, to help them forward in their way to Heaven. But alas! 'Tis Mr.* Bows *and his party that are afraid of the growth of Mr.* Webbers *Congregation: And therefore did suspend from their Communion, one* Isaac Harman *by Name, a Joyner in* Portsmouth, *for hearing Mr.* Webber: *this the Young Man told me himself, and ask'd my advice about it; and Mr.* Bows *told me himself before Mr.* Francis Williams, *that if he could Believe that our Doctrine of Original Sin,*

Sin, he ſhould think Infants had need of Baptiſm: And wonder'd the People of Goſport *ſhould Scruple the Practice of Infant Baptiſm, and yet maintain the Doctrine of Original Sin. This Man it ſeems wants not expreſs Command or Example, but only to be feelingly acquainted with the univerſal Corruption of Humane Nature; and then would readily Embrace our Practice. I Pray God open his Eyes, and convince him of this great truth, which is of far greater weight than this of Baptiſm.*

A N

ABRIDGMENT

OF THOSE

SERMONS

THAT WERE

The Innocent Occaſion of the Diſputation.

HEre I muſt unavoidably dip my Pen in the Watry Controverſy: I love not to meddle with matters of Diſpute, eſpecially where Sober and Good Men are at Odds: But I cannot do right to my Subject, without mentioning the Grounds of our Practice, both as to the Subjects of Baptiſm, and the manner of its Adminiſtration. I ſhall according to the order of the Diſputation,

Firſt, mention what I offer'd, as to the Subjects of Baptiſm.

Firſt

1. I ſhall prove from Scripture, t arrantableneſs of Infant Baptiſm, or of the Baptizing the Infants of Believing Parents. Here I ſhall not burden you with many Scriptures, that might be produced : but only mention ſome few that I think moſt clear.

Firſt From *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go, Diſciple all Nations Baptizing them.* From hence I thus argue.

1. The Infants of Believing Parents are Diſciples, and therefore ought to be Baptiz'd. Now we have a plain Text that theſe Infants are Diſciples, in *Acts* 15. 19. *Why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Necks of the Diſciples, which neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear?* This Yoke was that of Circumciſion, a very painful ordinance, Adminiſtred to Infants of 8 days old; this Yoke theſe falſe Teachers would impoſe not only on the Gentile Chriſtians but their Infants too, and therefore St. *Paul* was acus'd by them, that he taught, they ſhould not Circumciſe their Children nor Keep the Cuſtoms of *Moſes*, *Acts* 21. 21. Now when our Saviour ſays *Go, Diſciple all Nations*: The Apoſtles muſt need underſtand, that ſuch as were Diſciples in the Jewiſh State, ſhould be admitted to this ordinance in the Chriſtian Church.

2. Infants are a conſiderable part of a Nation, and therefore we cannot ſuppoſe, they ſhould be excluded, except they were excluded by Name or good Conſequence.

3. All Nations, is here put in oppoſition to the one Nation of the Jews. As if our Saviour had ſaid, whereas the Jews have hitherto been the peculiar People of God, and admitted to peculiar Priviledges, now I admit all Nations to the ſame Priviledges, the Jews only enjoy'd before; *Eph.* 2. 12, 13. Now it was a great Priviledg among the Jews, that their Infants were dedicated and devoted to God, and admitted into his Church, and Covenant, in their early years; therefore the Apoſtles muſt needs underſtand, when our Saviour ſaid, all Nations ſhould be Diſcipled, that the Gentiles, and their Children ſhould be admitted to the ſame Priviledges, the Jews enjoy'd before.

4. Our Saviour muſt needs intend Infants unleſs he had excluded them. If he would not be any longer a God in Covenant with them, he would have raz'd out their Names. Suppoſe the words had run thus: *Go, Diſciple all Nations, Circumciſing them*; the Apoſtles muſt have underſtood that their Infants were intended, and why not the ſame, when only the rite is alter'd? Or ſuppoſe it had run, *Go, Diſciple the Jews, Baptizing them*; They muſt needs admit Infants that were admitted before. So that whereas our miſtaken Brethren call for an expreſs Scripture for Infant Baptiſm, we have reaſon to anſwer, there needs expreſs Scripture to revoke that Privileg and Covenant Intereſt which Infants injoy'd before. If it had been Chriſts intention to have excluded Infants from the Church, there muſt have been a poſitive Law, where ſuch an intention of Chriſt ſhould have been expreſs'd: for nothing can make that unlawful, which was a Duty before, but a direct and expreſs prohibition from the *Legiſlator* himſelf; * who alone hath Power to Reſcind, as well as make Laws. You know there was a great Controverſy, whether Circumciſion ſhould continue or not, *Acts* 21. 21: and certainly there would have been a far greater, if, upon their coming to Chriſt, their Infants had been excluded the Church, and ranked with Heathens; but ſeeing we find no Objections made about this matter, nor that our Saviour ever révok'd this Priviledg, we may be aſſur'd they ſtill enjoy it.

* *Stilling-Fleet Iren.* pag. 7.

5. The Practice of Baptizing Infants was cuſtomary among the *Jews*; thoſe that have but dip'd their fingers in the *Jewiſh* Writings know, that not only *Proſelytes* (as Mr. *Tombs* acknowledgeth) but Native *Jews* themſelves, were admitted into the Church by Circumciſion, as an initiating ordinance; by Baptiſm, as a purifying Ceremony, to waſh them from Legal Uncleanneſs, which they might ignorantly contract; and by Sacrifice to expiate their Sin; and that this was not a Corrupt Tradition, but grounded on thoſe many Texts, that require waſhing from uncleanneſs: And therefore this Practice is grounded on, *Gen.* 35. 2. *Exod.* 19. 10. by the

Gemera

Gemera Talmud, and *Maimonides*. Now therefore seeing Infants were thus admitted by Baptism, and our Saviour was pleas'd to adopt this custom into a Christian Sacrament, we have reason to believe that Infants are admitted now as before.

2. Another Scripture is in *Acts* 2. 38, 39. *Repent and be Baptized, for the promise is to you and to your Children; and to those afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* The Apostle *Peter* doth in this place perswade those he had convinc'd, of the greatness of their Sin, in murdering the Lord of Glory, penitently to return to God, and then Incourages them to hope, they should again be receiv'd into Favour with God: And, says he, the promise will be made good, not only to you but to your Children too: And to the Gentile World also, Even to as many as the Lord our God shall call. Thence I argue.

1. This promise, was the great promise to *Abraham*. Some pretend it is only that promise in *Joel* 2. 8. Gods giving extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; That their Sons and Daughters should Prophecy. But this cannot be, because that promise was not fullfill'd to all afar off. Have all the Gifts of Tongues? Do all Prophecy? The promise signifys the great promise Καὶ ἔξομαι to *Abraham*, *I will be a God to thee and to thy seed*, *Gen.* 17. 17. Therefore this is call'd the promise *Gal.* 3. 14. *That the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, thro' Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit, thro' Faith.* The Blessing of *Abraham*: That great Blessing that God would be a God to him and his seed. Now if this great Blessing come to the Gentiles, Then they and their seed ought to receive the token of the Covenant; the Children of the promise ought to have the Seal affixed to it.

2. The Apostle useth these words to comfort the *Jews*, that had Imprecated Divine Vengeance on themselves and their Children, Infants as well as others; a curse that lies on the unbeleiving *Jews* to this day: *His blood be upon us and our Children*; no doubt, but many of those, that were prick'd at the heart at *Peters* Sermon, joyn'd with the rabble in that Loud cry; *Crucifie him*, *Crucifie*

Crucifie him, and were concern'd not only for themſelves but their Children too; therefore the Apoſtle uſes this Argument, if you penitently return to God by faith in Chriſt, the curſe ſhall be taken off from you and your Children, you and yours ſhall be admitted again, and not only ſo, but thoſe that are afar off, the Gentile World, when call'd.

3. If the words were to be reſtrain'd, only to thoſe that believe and repent themſelves, and concern not their Infants; this would be an Argument to perſwade the *Jews*, to continue in the Synagogue ſtill, rather than to come into the Chriſtian Church. While Synagogue worſhip ſtood before Chriſts coming, God had promis'd happy Priviledges, to themſelves and Children; but now if afterwards their Children muſt be caſt off, and look'd on as no other than Heathens, and ſtrangers to the Covenants of promiſe, this would incline them rather to continue in the Synagogue, than enter into the Chriſtian Church.

A Third Scripture is in *Rom.* 11.15, 25. In thoſe verſes, theſe following things are contain'd.

1. The Apoſtle ſpeaks of breaking off from and graſſing into the Viſible Church; that the Unbelieving *Jews* were broken off from that Viſible Church, to which they were related before, by their poſitive unbelief, and rejecting Chriſt; and that the Gentile Believers were graff'd in, and ſo partook of thoſe Priviledges, from which the Gentiles were broken off.

2. Some only were broken off, the reſt that Believ'd, injoy'd the ſame Priviledges they did before, *v.* 17*th.* Now this was a great Priviledg, that God would be a God to them and to their ſeed: Therefore they ſtill injoy'd the ſame.

3. What Priviledges the *Jews* left, the whole body ſhall be reſtor'd to, when the fulneſs of the Gentiles ſhall come in, *v.* 25. therefore their Infants ſhall be reſtor'd to the ſame Priviledges they injoy'd before.

4. The Believing Gentiles are admitted to the Priviledges the *Jews* injoy'd before, grafted into the ſame Olive-Tree, *v.* 24. Seeing *Jewiſh* Infants were intereſted in the Church and Covenant of God, the Infants of Believing

lieving Gentiles are also in Covenant, and consequently ought to have Baptism, the Seal, applyed to them.

4. A Fourth Scripture is in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.* Hence I argue, If the Children of Believers are holy, then this ordinance ought to be Administer'd to them. The only difficulty here, is to understand what is meant, by holiness in this place.

1. Internal Holiness cannot be ascrib'd to all the Infants of believers. Because we find by sad experience, that many of them shametully Apostatize from God, and thereby plainly shew, the Seed of Grace was never in them, 1 *John* 3. 9.

2. Neither can it be understood of bare Legitimacy, as our mistaken brethren pretend. For,

1. The Word is never us'd in this sense, in all the Scripture.

2. The Children of Heathens, if begotten in Lawful Wedlock, are Legitimate, as well as of Believers; therefore this can be no distinguishing mark, as in this place.

3. The Apostle's Argument would be weak and unconcluding, if he should only prove that they were Lawful Man and Wife, because their Children were Lawfully begotten. The Question propos'd to the Apostle was this. Supposing a believing Wife Marry'd to an unbeliever, or *e contra*, whether the believer should dwell with the unbeliever, or part one from another. The Apostle Answers,

If the unbeliever be willing to abide, let them do so, For the unbelieving Wife is sanctified by the Husband. and else were your Children unclean, but now are they Holy. Because one Parent is a believer, therefore their Children are peculiarly related to God, and in Covenant with him.

Now if bare Legitimacy were intended, then the Argument would run thus: You have no Reason to question, whether you are Man and Wife, because your Children are Lawfully begotten. Can any believe any could question the one, and yet grant the other?

4. This would not answer the *Corinthians* Scruple: They did not question, whether co-habiting with Unbe-

believers

lievers, expos'd them to Fornication; but, whether it would expose them to *Irreligion*, or at least, great Temptations. Now, says the Apostle, *How knowest thou, O Man, but thou may'st save thy Wife?* However, your Children are holy, because one is a believer.

3. By holiness is meant Relative or Federal Holiness. That the Children of Believers are Separated to God, enter'd into a new Relation to him, by vertue of his Covenant. Thus the *Israelites* are said to be a holy People, because Separated to God as his peculiar Treasure, *Deut.* 14. 2. 26. 19. the Infants of Believing Parents are thus holy, as related to God and enjoying distinguishing marks of Favour, therefore ought to have this distinguishing ordinance apply'd to them?

2. What Priviledges are the Infants of Believers Invested in by Baptism?

1. They are solemnly admitted into the Visible Church; no longer strangers to the Covenants of Promise, but more nearly related to God, than the Infants of Heathens.

2. Peculiarly interested in the Churches Prayers; we are bound indeed to pray for all Men, but more peculiarly for the Church of God, *Gal.* 6. 16.

3. Have a Title to Gods peculiar care. God gives his Angels a charge over them, *Mat.* 18. 10.

4. They stand nearer to, and are the more especial Objects of the promises of Grace, *Is.* 44. 3. 59. Infants are call'd by Gods Name, therefore tho' Gods Grace is free, yet we have more Reason to hope, the promises will be made good to them than others. The vein of Election frequently runs in the Channel of Believing Parents, and their seed.

5. They are put into a new Covenant Relation. As *Abraham* receiv'd the sign of Circumcision, as a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, to himself and seed, *Rom.* 4. 11. So this ordinance of Baptism, shall be a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, to Believers and their seed.

6. If they dye during their Infant State, they shall be saved. Our Saviour useth this Argument for the proof of the Resurrection. *I am the God of Abraham*, *Mat.* 22. 32. Now for God to be the God of any, is

to

to distinguish them from others by his rewards; he did not do thus for *Abraham*, and his Family, in this World, therefore there is another, *Heb.* 11. 16. Now when God is said to be a God to Believers and their seed, the meaning is, he will be a rewarder of them; therefore if they dy in their Infant State, they have a promise to rely on, that God will receive them to Salvation. Whereas others must leave their Children to the unfathomable depths of Divine Mercy, as they do the Heathen World.

3. The Practical ules of Infant Baptism beyond that of Years. This I do the rather, to take off the Common Objection, that Infant Baptism is an useless Ordinance.

1. By Baptizing our Infants we practically own our Original Pollution. Those Baptiz'd at Riper Years own themselves Sinners by Practice; but do not necessarily own, that there is a Fountain of Sin within: But when we offer our Children to be Bapriz'd, we acknowledg that we have been Instruments of conveying polluted Natures to our Infants; and that they need washing by the Blood and Spirit of Christ. Thus the Prophet sets forth our sinful State, by the Pollutionsof a new born Infant, *Ezek.* 16. 4.

2. Hereby we practically acknowledg the Necessity of Gods free Grace, in order to our recovery. As an Infant cannot contribute to his Baptism, but is purely passive; So we can contribute nothing, by any Work or Merit of our own, towards obtaining the Grace of God, and Regenerating Influences of his Spirit. *It is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that sheweth Mercy, Rom.* 9. 16.

3. Hereby we practically own Christs universal Headship, that he is Lord of all, of all Ages, Sexes, and Conditions. Those that deny their Children, to be in Covenant with God, hereby deny them to be Visible Members of Christ; And thus rob him of a great part of his Subjects, and indeed rob themselves of that comfort they might enjoy: they look upon their Infants, as in the same case and State, with the Heathen World. If Christ save them, it is by a Prerogative of Mercy, and not as his Members or Covenant Children; but *for this*

cause Christ both Died, and Rose, and revived, that he might be the Lord, of the Dead and Living. Rom. 14. 9. and as Christ whilst an Infant himself, was Head of the Church, so he is pleas'd to admit of Infant Members, in Covenant with him.

4. Infant Baptism lays stronger Obligations on Parents, to train up their Children for God. Certainly 'tis a mighty Obligation on a Parent to consider, 1. I have 'Solemnly devoted my Child to God. Solemnly promis'd, 'before the Minister, and in the Face of a great Congrega-'tion, that I will Endeavour by hearty Prayers, Serious 'Instructions, and a Religious Example, to train up my 'Child for God; the vows of the Lord are upon me, 'and I shall add perjury to the rest of my Sins, if I Neg-'lect them. The Prophet makes it, a great Agravation of the *Israelites* Sin, that they had taken their Sons and Daughters that they had Born unto God, and Sacrific'd them to Idols. *Ezek.* 16. 21. and it follows, *Thou hast slain my Children.* God calls them his Children, as born in his Family, and Solemnly devoted to him. So the sin of Christians will be highly aggravated, if they bring up their Children for the destroyer, and Neglect those Parental Instructions, they have oblig'd themselves to.

5. Infant Baptism Engages Children to acquaint themselves, with the Terms and Tenour of the Covenant. When Children are told by their Parents, how Solemnly they were enter'd into Covenant with God, this engages them to enquire betimes, what they are by Nature, what they may be by Grace, and to understand all the Principles of Religion, in order to that end.

6. Infant Baptism Engages us against Sin Betimes. We are prepossess'd with a happy Prejudice against Sin, in our Early Years; and this is a great advantage. *When Hannibal was but 9 years Old, his Father made him lay his hand upon the Altar, and Swear, that he would be an Irreconcilable Enemy to the Romans*: And this was the Reason he would never admit of any Peace with them. My Friends, we were Engaged for God against Sin, and the Devil, as our Irreconcilable Enemies, not at 9 Years Old, but in our Infant State; and this obliges us to maintain a constant Enmity against them for ever.

7.

7. Infant Baptism is a great Encouragement for Faith in Prayer, with Respect to our Children. Those that have dedicated their Children to God in Baptism, may pray to God, with larger Measures of Faith and Hope, than such as have Neglected this Duty. They may say, 'Lord I have resign'd them up unto thee; Brought them 'to thine Authoriz'd Representative to be listed into thy 'Family; consented for them, to the claims of thy Co'venant; and the token of thy Covenant, hath been ap'ply'd to them; let the Promises of thy Covenant be 'made good to them. They are call'd by thy Name, 'do thou receive them: They are Visible Members of thy 'Church. Oh give them the Favours that belong to thy 'Children. A Visible Relation to God is a good Encouragement for Faith in Prayer. *We are call'd by thy Name: Thou beareſt not Rule over them. Jer.* 14. 9. Those that have not thus dedicated their Children to God, can only say, Lord be Merciful to them, tho' they are not call'd by thy Name, and make them thine. But we have a better Plea; and can say, Lord they are call'd by thy Name.

8. Infant Baptism adds to the Parents comfort. They may comfortably hope as to their living seed, that if they are Faithful in training them up for God, he will according to his promise, *Isa.* 44. 3. pour out his Spirit and Blessing upon them: and as to those that die in an Infant State, they have Reason to Believe and hope, that they are happy, because God hath promis'd to be a God to them, and to their seed: Whereas those that Neglect this ordinance have no more Reason to hope for the Salvation of their Infants, than the Heathens; must only leave them, to the unfathomable depths of Gods Goodness, having no promise to rely upon.

4. I shall answer some Principal Objections against this Truth.

1. There is no Precept nor Example for Infant Baptism, in all the New Testament; This is a Common Objection, and therefore deserves a distinct answer.

1. To this I Answer: What Express Command or Example can they produce for previous Examination of Persons that offer themselves to be Baptiz'd; for Stated

Prayer, before and after this Ordinance; or for dipping or Plunging the whole Body under Water? All these things must be deduc'd by consequence; for no expreſs Scripture can be produc'd for them. I may add, what expreſs Command have they for ſinging Pſalms in Rhime and Metre, which is the Practice of the moſt Orthodox Anabaptiſts at this day? I mention this the rather, to convince Mr. *Webber* and his adherents, what a doughty Champion they have choſen for themſelves. For this Dr. *Ruſſel* hath written ſome Animadverſions on his Brother *Allen*'s Eſſay, on ſinging Pſalms; wherein he advances the very ſame Arguments, againſt their Practice of ſinging Pſalms, that he doth againſt ours for Infant Baptiſm; and therefore hath prov'd himſelf a Hackny diſputant, that hath one conſtant Read, and train of Arguments, upon all occaſions. Perhaps I may be ſo dull of Apprehenſion, as not to be able to Anſwer them, therefore muſt cry, Men of *Iſrael* help. *The Arguments of* Ruſſel *againſt Allen, pag.* 9.

'If it doth not appear from Scripture, or any Authentic 'Hiſtory, that the Pſalms of *David* were Tranſlated into 'Rhime or Metre till the *16th* Century, then it is impoſſible 'any Church could ſo ſing them, as our Brethren now 'do; the *Major* is undeniable, the *Minor* I thus prove.

'If it be ſo recorded, you or ſome other are able to 'ſhow it.

'Further, if Singing in Rhime or Metre was never 'practic'd in any Church, till the *16th* Century, then it 'was, becauſe our Lord Jeſus had not commanded it 'ſo to be.

'If our Lord had Commanded it, his Apoſtles would 'have ſo taught the Churches.

'If the Apoſtles were faithful in the diſcharge of their 'Miniſtry, and kept back nothing, that was profitable to 'the Churches, but declar'd to them the whole Councel of 'God, then they did teach the Churches all that the Lord 'Jeſus Commanded.

'If the Apoſtles did teach the Churches to ſing in 'Rhime and Metre, then it is ſomewhere ſo recorded in 'the New Teſtament. Thus argues this mighty Man of Logick; but as he cannot diſtinguiſh between Rhime and

Metre,

Metre, so I can see, neither Rhime nor Reason in his discourse: these were the Arguments for want of better, he trifled with at *Portsmouth*; but Mr. *Webber* (to whose Civility I am indebted, for a sight of this curious peice,) must either Renounce his beloved Rhimes, or comply with the Practice of Infant Baptism, notwithstanding the Wonderful Arguments of his Champion to the contrary. But to return from this digression.

2. Those Truths that were Establish'd in the Old Testament, are rather suppos'd than positively expres'd in the New; but the Grounds and Foundations upon which Infant Baptism stands, were Establish'd in the Old Testament. Infants were then admitted into the Covenant and Church of God: Except therefore Christ had blotted their Names out of the Covenant, and Rolls of the Church; They are to be continued there, under the New Testament. Thus a Magistracy was setled under the Old Testament, but there is no precept for it under the New; the Lawfulness of War was then setled, but suppos'd, not expresly under the New. The forbidden degrees of Marriage, were setled under the Old Testament: No need of mentioning them again under the New.

3. Ans. There are many Virtual and General Commands for the Baptizing of Infants in the New Testament, which were mention'd before.

4. Ans. There was no need of an expres Command, because it was the constant Practice of the Church, when the Scripture was written, in conformity to the Practice of the *Jews*, for many Ages before. I cannot here expres my self better, than in the words of the Learned *Lightfoot* *. It Baptism and Baptizing of Infants had been as strange and unheard of a thing, till *John* Baptist came, as Circumcision was, till God appointed it to *Abraham*; There would then no doubt, have been an expres Command for Baptizing Infants, as there was for Circumcising them. But when the Baptizing of Infants, was a thing commonly known and us'd, as appears by Unconteitable Evidence from all their Writers; there need not be expres Assertions, that such and such Persons

* *Lightfoots Harmony on* Joh. 1 25.

sons were to be the Objects of Baptism, when it was as well known before the Gospel began, that Men, Women and Children were Baptiz'd, as it is to be known that the Sun is up when it shines at noon day.

5. There would need a Positive Command, to exclude Infants, who were admitted into Covenant before. The *Jews* were extremely tender of their Priviledges, and you know there was a great dispute among them, whether their Children should be Circumcis'd, *Acts.* 21. 21. Now if their Children were wholly cast out of Covenant, this would have enrag'd them much more; seeing therefore, there is not one word in Scripture, that once mentions the unchurching of Infants, not one Apostle, that once questions or discovers it, the believing *Jews* did not once Scruple it, nor the unbelieving once charge it on Christ; nor the Councel in *Acts* 15. Reveal it, tho' they that taught Infants should be Circumciz'd, did suppose they were Church-Members. I say seeing all these things are True, Infants are Church-Members still, and consequently ought to be Baptiz'd.

6. There are Examples of whole Houshold's that were Baptiz'd in Scripture, and we may well conclude, as *Abrahams* Children, In *Luk.* 19. 9. Christ saith to *Zaccheus*, *Salvation is come to this House, for that he also is the Son of Abraham.* *Zaccheus* was a *Publican*, and a gatherer of the *Roman Tribute*, and perhaps a Gentile, but upon his Faith in Christ, he becomes a Spiritual Son of *Abraham*, and Salvation comes not only to himself, but his House; God becomes a God to him and his. So when we read of so many Houshold's Baptiz'd, upon the Parents and Masters Believing, we have Reason to conclude their Infants were Baptiz'd, as *Abraham* and his were Circumciz'd.

7. There is no Instance of any Christian Child, whose Baptism was defer'd still he came to Years. There was great Reason that they who had been *Jews* or Heathens before, should upon their undertaking Christianity, be Baptiz'd at Years: as *Abraham* at the first Institution of Circumcision was Circumciz'd, when he was old; but we may well suppose, their Children (as *Abrahams*,) were Baptiz'd with them, and afterwards in their Infant State.

Now

Now it is utterly unaccountable, that in that long track of time, between St. *Mathews Gospel* and the *Revelations*, when many Christian Infants were grown adult, we should read of none that were Baptiz'd, but only of *Jews* and Heathens, I say this is unaccountable, and therefore supposeth they were Baptiz'd in Infancy.

Obj. 2. Infants are uncapable of performing the Duties prerequir'd to Baptism. Of confessing their Sins, *Mat.* 3. 6. Of Repenting, *Acts* 2. 38. Of gladly receiving the word, *Acts* 2. 41. Of Believing, *Mar.* 16. 16.

1. Infants are admitted on the account of their Parents faith. As the Infants of Believing *Jews*, so are the Infants of Christians; nor is this at all unreasonable. For as Infants contract Guilt from their Parents, why may they not also partake of Mercy, on account of their Parents; except God be more inclin'd to Acts of Justice, than Mercy? As many were heal'd of their Bodily diseases, by the faith of their Parents, *Math.* 15. 28. So why may they not be admitted into Gods Church on the same account? As the *Jewish* Infants, Covenanted with God, in and by their Parents, *Deut.* 29. 11. 12. So why may not Christian Infants Covenant in and by them? As Children are said to come to Christ, being brought in the Arms of their Nurses or Parents, *Luk.* 18. 15. 16. So why may they not be said Spiritually to come to Christ, in the Arms of their Parents Faith? As Parents enter their Childrens Names in Leases and Covenants, and the Children are oblig'd to stand to these Covenants, and do injoy these Priviledges, when they come to Years: So why may they not enter their Childrens Names into the Covenant, and Church of God, tho' at present they are uncapable of Personally Engaging themselves?

2. Infants are oblig'd to these duties as soon as they are capable; and their Early Engagements in Baptism, lay the more strong and forcible Obligation upon them to do so. If afterwards they revolt from God, their Sin will be more highly aggravated, as adding Perjury and Apostacy to the rest of their Sins: and this may be one Reason why, sometimes, the Children of Believers are worse than others, because they Sin against greater Light and Love, and stronger Engagements than other men, and there

fore

fore justly provoke the Holy Spirit to forsake them. The *Levites* of a Month Old are said to keep the charge of the Sanctuary, because they were devoted to this Office, and bound to it when capable, *Num.* 3. 28. So the Infants of Believers are devoted to the Service of God: And bound to Believe, repent, confess their Sins, and gladly receive the word, as soon as capable.

3. These Texts therefore only shew what was requir'd of grown Persons, when Baptism was first appointed in the Christian Church. Those Persons were either *Jews* or Heathens before, and therefore must Renounce their former Errors, and profess the Christian Faith; but this is no Prejudice against Infants who are to be admitted with them. As when *Abraham* was Circumciz'd, he first Believ'd in God, and Submitted to this Ordinance, but afterwards the Infants of the *Jews* were Circumciz'd in their Infant State: So if we were to Preach to the *Indians*, we must first perswade them to Believe and Repent before Baptism; but when once they had Believ'd, their Infants would have the same right with themselves.

4. As to *Mar.* 16. 16. because many are apt to insist on the order of the words, and argue that Faith is put before Baptism, and therefore ought to precede it,

1 Answer: The order of the words is not always to be exactly regarded. For confessing of Sin is put after Baptism; *Matth.* 3. 6. Besides, this would condemn all Infants; for, if, because they cannot Believe, they ought not to be Baptiz'd, then for the same Reason they must all be damn'd. 'Tis not positively said he that is not Baptiz'd shall be damn'd; Baptism is not of Absolute Necessity to Salvation: But it is positively said, he that Believeth not shall be damn'd. If the latter part of this verse be Interpreted of Grown Persons, so also must the former. As for Grown Persons, Faith must go before Baptism: But it doth not follow, that Infants are hence excluded from Baptism, no more than from Salvation. Our Saviour doth therefore here, only give a general direction to his Apostles, to Preach the Gospel to every Creature, and admit the Gentiles to the same Priviledges with the *Jews*, and shews them the Issue of the Execution of their Commission; that those

Jews,

Jews, or *Heathens* that would renounce their former Idolatry, and believing y submit to the Ordinance, as a Solemn Entrance into the Church, should be saved; but those that wilfully persisted in unbelief, shou'd be damn'd. So that this is no Prejudice to Infants, who are still in Covenant with God thro their Parents Faith, and were never cast out.

I proceed to the 2d General Question. After what manner, the outward Element in Baptism, ought to be apply'd, whether by dipping or plunging the whole Body under Water, or whether pouring Water on the Face be not sufficient? To which I Answer,

1. It is not Absolutely Necessary that this Ordinance should be administred by dipping or plunging the whole Body under the Water. There are many mistaken Brethren lay too great a stress on this; but it proceeds from their ignorance of the Scriptures.

1. The Holy Ghost, never uses Βαπτω, which most frequently signifys to dip, but Βαπτιζω: Now why should the Holy Ghost consecrate a new Word for this Ordinance; if dipping had been the only way of administring it? Now Βαπτω is always us'd where dipping is signify'd. *Mat.* 26. 23. *Joh.* 13. 26. *He that dippeth with me in the dish. Luk.* 16. 24. *dip his finger. Rev.* 19. 13. *with Garments dip'd in Blood.*

2. The *Greek* word Βαπτιζω, is us'd in a differing sense in Scripture. Thus you read, *Mar.* 7. 4. *The Pharisees eat not except they wash oft.*

Now the way of washing among the *Jews*, was this; a Servant was ready to pour water, on his Masters hands, hence *Elisha* is thus describ'd. 2 *Kings* 3. 11. *Here is* Elisha *that pour'd Water on the hands of his Master* Elijah. So we read of washing of cups and pots, Brasen Vessels, and Tables or Beds. *Mar.* 7. 4. the *Greek* word is *Baptizo*. Surely they did not carry them out to a River and dip them there, but pour'd water on them, and so made them clean. Again, *Heb.* 9. 10. we read of divers washings; *Baptisms* in the *Greek*. Now what were these Baptisms but *v.* 13. 21. *Moses*'s Sprinkling the Book and all the People, with the Blood of *Calves* and *Goats* and Water. So that Ραντιζω and Βαπτιζω signify the same thing. Let not Injudicious People therefore pretend, that ours is only *Ransism*, when we find in Scripture that *Ransism*;

and Baptism are us'd promiscuously for the same.

3. There is no certainty that dipping was ever us'd in Scripture times. All those Scriptures that are commonly urg'd to this purpose, may be easily apply'd another way. If we begin with *John* the Baptist, he is said to Baptize not in, but with Water, as Christ with the Holy Ghost and Fire. *Luk.* 3. 16. Now how did Christ Baptize with the Holy Ghost and Fire? but at the day of pentecost when the Holy Ghost was pour'd on them. *Acts.* 10. 45. I know the learned *Casaubon*'s witty Criticism that in *Acts* 2. when the Holy Ghost came upon them it is said, *There came a sound from Heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it fill'd the House.* So that they were as in a Fish Pond Overwhelm'd with the Holy Ghost. But to this I Answer, it was the sound that fill'd the House, and not the Cloven Tongues of Fire, which were the Emblems of the Holy Ghost, and sure they were not Overwhelm'd with these; but that promise was made good, I will pour out my Spirit. *Acts* 2. 17. Now the pouring out of the Spirit, is frequently represented by pouring out water, *Is.* 44. 3.

But several Scriptures are pretended for dipping; the most material are these.

1. *Mat.* 3. 16. *Jesus went up out of the water.*

I Answer, he might acording to the Practice of those times, go into the Water to wash his Feet, foul with Travelling, and *John* might pour Water on his Face; but the *Greek* word may be render'd, he went up from the Water. The like Answer may be given to *Mar.* 1. 9. *Jesus was Baptiz'd of John in Jordan.* It doth not prove his whole Body was plung'd there. Nay ἐκ frequently signifys *to*, and if we compare this place with *Mat.* 3. 13. *Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee to Jordan to be Baptized of John.* So here we may read the words with a Parenthesis: *And Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, (and was Baptiz'd of John) to Jordan*

2. Another Scripture is *Joh.* 3. 23. *John Baptized in Enon, because there was much Water there.*

I Answer, much Water may be meant not of depth but length, many streams and Rivulets, where *John* and his Disciples might conveniently together Baptize or pour Water on the Multitudes.

3.

3. Another Scripture is *Acts* 8. 38. where *Philip* and the *Eunuch* are ſaid both to go down into the Water; whence ſome would infer that the *Eunuch* was dip'd. I Anſwer, they might only go down to, and come from the Water. So the *Greek* may be render'd, the Water running in the valleys. But if Men will inſiſt on the letter of the Text, *Philip muſt dip himſelf as well as the Eunuch*; for they both went down. Or they might go ankle deep, and *Philip* might pour Water on his Head or Face: either of theſe Interpretations are probable, and therefore it cannot Neceſſarily be prov'd he was dipt; beſides the unlikelihood that he was dipt on a Journey, when perhaps he might have no cloaths to change.

4. The Principal Scripture they boaſt of, is *Rom.* 6. 4. *Being Buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm.* Whence they argue Baptiſm muſt repreſent a Burial, therefore the whole Body muſt be cover'd with Water. This Text we have given a diſtinct Anſwer to, in our Reflections on Dr. *Kuſſel, Chap.* 2. *Refl.* 12. 13. therefore thither I Refer the Reader, and ſhall only ſay here,

1. It is no where ſaid that Baptiſm repreſents Chriſts Burial, but only that we are oblig'd to conform our ſelves thereby to Chriſts Death, Burial, and Reſurrection, to die to Sin, and riſe again to newneſs of Life: This we do whatever rite be us'd.

2. In our way (if that will ſatisfy) there is a Repreſentation of Chriſts Death, the pouring out of Water denoting the pouring his Blood or Soul; of his Burial, as the Face the Principal part of the Body, is put under the Water; of his Reſurrection when the Child is taken up and deliver'd again to its Parents or Offerers.

3. If they will keep ſtrictly to the Significancy of a Burial; the Perſon to be Baptiz'd, muſt not walk into the Water, but be taken up by the Baptizer and caſt down into it: for indeed the difference between our way and theirs is only this, we Baptize the face and they Baptize the head and ſhoulders too.

4. *Metaphors* muſt not be ſtretched too far, and let our Brethren take heed, how they ſtretch this Expreſſion ſo, as to Juſtify the Practice of others, that differ

from them; you read *v. 6. our Old Man is Crucify'd with Christ.* Hence the *Romanists* infer the Necessity of Crossing in Baptism; let not the *Metaphor* therefore be stretch'd too far.

5. There are many more Scriptures, that have an Allusion to Sprinkling or pouring Water on the Face: thus we read *Is.* 44. 3. *I will pour Water on him that is thirsty, &c.* which is Interpreted of Gods pouring out his Spirit, and Blessing on the seed of Believers. So *Heb.* 10. 22. *Having your Hearts Sprinkled from an Evil Conscience, and your Bodys wash'd with pure Water*: And many other places. So that our way most fairly Represents the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, together with the Application of his Blood, and Spirit; and the Anabaptists of *Amsterdam* are so sensible of this, that they Generally Baptize by pouring Water upon the Head.

4. There is great probability, (if not certainty) that many were not dip'd in Scripture times. Particularly *Acts* 2. 41. we read of 3000 Baptiz'd in part of a day. And this was at *Jerusalem* where there were no Rivers, but only the Brook *Cedron*. Besides these were either dipt naked, or with their Cloaths; if Naked, this would be an unseemly sight, and look as if they were full of New Wine indeed, tho' (by the way) I think that part, that is Baptiz'd, ought to be Naked, to Represent our Nakedness before God: if with their Cloaths this would be as strange, for it cannot be expected, they brought Cloaths with them at that Juncture, and it would have been very unseemly, to see so many Persons come out of the Water in such a condition; and go down to their Houses, which might be at a great distance; not to mention that it was hardly possible, for the 12 Apostles, if we should add the 70 Disciples to them. (which yet the Text mentions not) to dip 3000 in so short a time, they had need have brawny Arms and an *Herculean* strength to do this.

Again we read *Acts* 9. 9. 18. that *Saul* after 3 days fasting was Baptiz'd by *Ananias*, we read not that he went out of the House; nor is it probable, that God (*who will have Mercy and not Sacrifice,*) would at that time require, he should be plung'd in Cold Water, which

which might Prejudice his Health or Life.

Again *Acts* 16. 33. The Jaylor and all his were Baptiz'd at midnight. 'Tis unlikely they went to a River at that time.

5. It is not the quantity of Water, but the quality that is Significant. As in the other Sacrament we are Commanded to Eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of Christ; So in this to be waſh'd in the Name of the Father Son and Holy Ghoſt: and as in the other, it is not ſaid what quantity of Bread we ſhall Eat, or Wine we ſhall Drink; So neither in this, after what manner the Water ſhall be apply'd, whether by dipping, Sprinkling or pouring Water on the Face. It might be equally pretended, that we muſt Eat and Drink plentifully at the Lords Table, becauſe this beſt ſets forth a Feaſt, as it is call'd 1 *Cor.* 5. 8. or Eat a whole Loaf to repreſent our partaking of Chriſts fulneſs, and receiving from him Grace for Grace: there is as much Neceſſity for this, as for dipping, to repreſent our Burial with Chriſt. But as a ſmall bit of Bread, and Moderate Draught of Wine, doth ſignificantly repreſent the Death of Chriſt; ſo a little Water doth as ſignificantly Repreſent the cleanſing virtue of Chriſts Blood.

6. It is very unlikely that dipping, which when mention'd in Scripture, is generally us'd as a token of Gods Vengeance, ſhould in this Sacrament be us'd as a token of his Mercy. Thus the Old World was dip'd and drown'd for their Sins, Gods Vengeance follow'd them, and they ſunk as lead in the Mighty Waters: But *Noah* and his Family, whoſe entrance into the Ark, was a Type of Baptiſm, as that is an Entrance into the Chriſtian Church 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. They were only wet with the Rain they met with in their paſſage. Thus the *Egyptians* were dip'd and drown'd in the Red-Sea, but the *Iſraelites* were Baptiz'd unto *Moſes*, in the Cloud and the Sea, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. by the dewings of the Cloud, and daſhing of the Waves. Thus the Lord Jeſus ſhall come down from Heaven, to render Vengeance on his Antichriſtian Enemies, with Garments dipt in Blood. *Rev.* 19, 13. I know the uſual Objection of *Naaman* the *Syrian*, of whom it is ſaid 2 *Kings* 5, 14. *he dip'd himſelf*

self in the River Jordan, Seven times, according to the saying of the Man of God. But this Objection I took off in the Disputation it self. Not according to the false representation of the Narrative, but thus: The Prophet bids him, *v.* 10. *go and wash in Jordan Seven times; and he washed himself*, as the *Hebrew* may be rendred, *according to the saying of the Man of God*. As when our Saviour commanded the blind man to wash in the Pool of *Siloam*, *John* 9. 7. he had no need to dip himself, but only to wash his Eyes. So *Naaman* the *Syrian* had no need to wash any part of his body, but only where he was affected with Leprosie: And therefore till it can be prov'd, that *Naaman* was a Leper all over, this Objection is of no Force. This was my Answer then, which perfectly silenced *Russel*. This Argument I us'd not to prove the absolute Unlawfulness of Dipping; for I lay no stress at all on the Mode of Administration; and tho Dipping be us'd in these places, as a Token of Vengeance, yet it may be apply'd in a way of Mercy. But I hence argue, it is very unlikely, that this way, and no other must be us'd in Baptism. And this may be a sufficient Answer to all that little Story about Mr. *Fox* in the Preface, and the Trifling Querys upon it.

2. Sprinkling, or pouring Water on the Face, in this Sacrament, is most significant. We pour water on the Face, the Noblest and Chiefest Part of Man. That part we pour water on is naked, to represent our nakedness before God; and this is sufficient, and significantly represents,

1. The Blood of Christ, whereby we are cleans'd from the Guilt and Filth of Sin. To this, there are particular Allusions made in many places of Scripture, *Heb.* 10, 22. 12. 23. 1 *Pet.* 1, 2.

2. It fitly Represents the Communications of the Spirit. The Spirit of God is promis'd to us under this *Metaphor*, *Is.* 44. 3. 52. 15, *Ezek.* 36. 25. Thus in this Ordinance is signify'd the pouring out of the Spirit, to cleanse us from that Pollution we have contracted.

3. Pouring Water on the Face, doth most aptly Represent the Grace of God apply'd to us, rather than dipping, whereby it may seem, as if we first apply'd our selves

ſelves to him. In dipping, the body is apply'd to the Water; in pouring, Water is apply'd to the body.

This moſt fitly Repreſents, that God is the firſt Mover in our Converſion; that Regeneration and Sanctification is his Work: Whereas the other way, inclines us rather to think that we cleanſe and purify our ſelves. It is no wonder, that they who magnify the Power of Nature, and think by their own free will they change and convert themſelves, are for this way; but as for thoſe that better underſtand the Scriptures, and their own weakneſs, and acknowledge that *it is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that ſheweth Mercy*, *Rom.* 9, 16. and that *God Works in us both to will and to do, according to his own Good Pleaſure*, *Phil.* 2, 13. *It* ſeems very unreaſonable for them to uſe ſuch a Practice, that Intimates as if Man had Power to change and convert himſelf.

Mr.

Mr. Chandler's *Prologue.*

My Friends,

IT is not out of Pride or Vanity, that I now appear in this Place, upon this occaſion. Moſt of you know, and I ſuppoſe many of you have heard, that, in the courſe of my Lecture here, I have been diſcourſing of the Principles of Religion: And having explain'd the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, did undertake to treat of the Doctrine of the Sacraments, particularly that of Baptiſm. *Thoſe that then heard me know, that I ſpake with a great deal of Modeſty, calling thoſe who deny* Infant-Baptiſm, *by no harder Name than* Miſtaken Brethren; *when I was unavoidably engag'd in this Diſputation by a bold and confident Challenge given me, which I knew not how to refuſe, unleſs I would betray that Truth which I believe to be the Truth of the Goſpel. They themſelves not being able to anſwer the Arguments I then uſed, have cryed out,* Men of *Iſrael,* come and help; *and therefore have ſent for this Gentleman from* London. *Now I deſire that all things may be managed with the greateſt Fairneſs and Calmneſs, that we may debate of theſe matters as Chriſtians, that nothing may be done that is tumultuous or diſorderly: And, as we have the Favour of the Govern-*

ment both Civil and Military, ſo, that we may give them no occaſion to repent of giving this Liberty. And I hope we ſhall all of us be willing to ſubmit to the Truth, as it is revealed in the Goſpel, and lay our ſelves open to Conviction. I have no more to add, but deſire all of you to joyn with me in this one Requeſt, That God would grant that Truth may prevail.

Chand. THE Queſtions to be diſputed of are theſe in order:

Q. 1. *Whether, according to the Commiſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, Adult Believers only are the proper Subjects of Baptiſm, or their Infants alſo?*

Q. 2. *Whether this Ordinance of Baptiſm, as appointed by Chriſt, be to be adminiſtred by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming only, and not otherwiſe?* We deny, and they affirm.

Ruſſel. I do ſuppoſe it will be neceſſary to underſtand, how much of this, that we affirm, Mr. *Chandler* owns, that we may not diſpute about thoſe things wherein we are agreed; whether you do own, that Adult Believers are the proper Subjects of Baptiſm?

Chand. If they were not baptized in Infancy, they ought to be ſo at Age.

Ruſ. You do ſuppoſe then that they are to be baptized by vertue of ſome Commiſſion, and that, the Commiſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

Chand. Yes.

Ruſ. Then with reſpect to the firſt Queſtion, *Whether Adult believers only, or whether Infants alſo may be admitted to Baptiſm?* And I ſuppoſe you do expect that I ſhould be Opponent.

Chan. Yes, that was agreed.

Ruſ. Well then, I ſhall endeavour (God aſſiſting) to prove, *Infants are not, according to Chriſt's Commiſſion, the proper Subjects of Baptiſm.*

Arg. If Chriſt hath no where required any of his Miniſter,

ſters to baptize Infants, then the Baptiſm of Infants is not according to the Commiſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

But Chriſt hath no where required any of his Miniſters, *&c. Ergo.*

Chan. I diſtinguiſh here upon your Antecedent. If you mean by Chriſt's Requiring, his Requiring Infants expreſly, and by Name, there is no need of it: But if by Requiring, you mean either expreſly, or by juſt conſequence; then I deny your Minor.

Ruſ. Then you ſuppoſe that Chriſt hath no where required it.

Chan. No. Diſtinguiſh between expreſs words and good conſequential Proofs.

Ruſ. It's neceſſary the people ſhould know what Mr. *Chandler* means; and therefore ——

Robinſon. It's fit indeed they ſhould know what he means; but it's alſo fit he ſhould explain his own meaning. You muſt not be permitted to explain Mr. *Coandler's* meaning in your own words. Your buſineſs is to prove what he denies.

Ruſ. I do hope, Gentlemen, that you will not thus break in upon us.

Rob. I do ſtand here on purpoſe to prevent Irregularity in the Diſputants.

Leigh. This Gentleman is our Moderator.

Ruſ. Pray what is your Name?

Rob. My Name is *Robinſon.*

Ruſ. Now if you will be ſilent, and Mr. *Chandler* be pleaſed to tell me what part of my Argument he denies, I ſhall proceed in the defence of it.

Chan. Repeat your Argument then.

Ruſ. If Chriſt hath no where required any of his Miniſters to baptize Infants, then the Baptiſm of Infants is not according to the Commiſſion of our Lord J. C. But Chriſt hath no where required, *&c. Ergo.*

Chan. Here, I ſay, as to the *Major*: If you mean by requiring, Chriſt's expreſly Requiring in ſo many words, that Infants ſhall be baptized, then I deny the Conſequence; but if you mean, that by genuine conſequence it cannot be drawn from Scripture; I deny the *Minor.*

Ruſ. The Term is very lax. I do not ſay, that he hath no

where commanded it, but no where required it. If it be any where required, it's enough. Give a direct Answer.

Leigh. VVill you allow good Scripture Consequence to be Proof in this case; or do you expect Scripture words expressly? Let us not dispute in the dark.

Gentlemen, you that are Notaries, pray observe how ambiguously Mr. *Russel* expresseth himself. He will not say whether he'll allow just Scripture-consequence for sufficient Proof.

Rus. I think I give my Sense in as plain words as I can.

L. Will you have it in express words, or good Consequence?

Williams. No reason for such a Distinction, because our brother hath said * *any way.*

Rus. It's all one to me, so you prove † the thing: Prove it any way.

Chand. I deny your Minor.

* *Any way; before, the words were any where.*

† *He is attempting to shift the Opponency.*

Rus. I prove it thus. Only I would let the people know what you say, *viz.* That Christ hath * *somewhere* required his Ministers to baptize Infants.

Leigh. Either expressly, or by Just Consequence.

* *Somewhere. The word is again altered from* any way *to* somewhere.

Rus. If Christ hath any where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants, then it is somewhere so recorded in the holy Scripture. But it is no where so recorded in the holy Scripture. Therefore.

Chand. This I answer by distinguishing again; If you mean by being so recorded in holy Scripture, its being there in somany express words, then I deny your Consequence; but if you mean that it's not so by good consequence, I deny your *Minor* again.

Rus. Let us not confound the people with so many Distinctions, but plainly deny what part you please *.

Leigh. I will make it appear, that there is that recorded in Scripture, which by just consequeuce will prove *what you deny.*

* *The Dr. now seems unwilling again to allow Scripture Consequence.*

Rus. If you can prove it so recorded, 'tis enough. .·.

.·. *Here Mr.* Leigh *was willing (tho the Respondent ought not to Prove) to offer Proof for the peoples satisfaction.*

Rob.

Rob. Pray Mr. *Leigh*—Mr. *Ruſſel* muſt prove, that it is not ſo recorded. This is what lies upon you, Sir *.

* Mr. Robinſon *will keep him to the Opponency.*

Ruſ. I would know what part Mr. *Chandler* denies.

Chan. I deny the *Minor*.

Ruſ. Then you ſay, it's ſomewhere ſo recorded in the holy Scriptures.

Chan. It's your buſineſs to prove the Negative.

Ruſ If it be ſomewhere ſo recorded in Scripture, then Mr. *Chandler*, Mr. *Leigh*, or ſome other perſon is able to ſhew it. But neither Mr. *Chandler*, Mr. *Leigh*, or any other perſon is able to ſhew it. Therefore.

Chan. I deny the *Minor*.

Ruſ. It's a Univerſal Negative, you muſt prove it. I appeal to the Moderator.

Rob. This ought not to be put upon the Reſpondent. You muſt prove it ſtill. Suppoſing that neither Mr. *Chandler*, nor Mr. *Leigh*, can give you an inſtance, you can't prove that none elſe can. If you can, we deſire you would.

Will. You are but Moderator, Let the diſputants alone.

Rob. But Mr. *Ruſſel* appeal'd to me.

Ruſ. I would have theſe honourable perſons here preſent, to conſider that I am under great diſadvantage——you are to give an Inſtance.

Rob. This is your Popular argument to ſhift the Opponency and turn it upon the Reſpondent.

Ruſ. If Mr. *Chandler* can give an inſtance, why do you hinder him? I ſay it's an Univerſal Negative, and I demand only an inſtance to the contrary.

Leigh. Offer him the Commiſſion——*All Nations.*

Robin. No reaſon for it to be allow'd; But if Mr. *Chandler*, is pleaſed to take the part of an Opponent upon him, Now he may.

——————I Suppoſe, Mr. *Ruſſel* you muſt needs know, ſince you have been ſo often engaged in ſuch work as this, that, according to all rules of Logick, you ought to prove the Negative. You do Univerſally Affirm this Propoſition, tho' in form it runs Negatively, That no perſon can give one inſtance in any record of holy Scripture, from whence we are obliged to baptize infants.

How do you prove this? It lyes upon you to prove it. Otherwise we must suppose Mr. *Russel* is a confident man, and asserts what he cannot prove.

Will. Mr. *Moderator* keep your place.

Rob. Sir I am in my place. I must not suffer the Disputants to break order: Mr. *Chandler* is Respondent and you are Opponents, and therefore pray keep your place.

Ruf. I would take notice of one thing. Mr. *Chandler* hath preach'd to the People, That there is a plain command for Infant Baptism in Scripture, and I argue upon him to give but one Instance, and you will not suffer him to do it.

Leigh. It's not Mr. *Chandlers* Sermon, but the Question, which we now argue upon.

Ruf. I hope that there are some Honourable Persons here that do understand the nature of this Controversy; And, I suppose, they will think it reasonable, that those who have made such a noise about this Practice ought to bring some colourable Proof for it. No, not one instance hath Mr. *Chandler* given. I am sure according to the rules of Dispute Mr. *Chandler* must prove the Negative.

Rob. I desire that the Persons here present would take notice, that however Mr. *Chandler* have asserted in this place, and very clearly proved the Baptism of Infants from the Commission of our *Ld. I. C.* yet you are not now to call upon him for proof, you having undertaken to prove the contrary. Mr. *Chandler* gives an answer; he denys your assertion, and therefore you must prove it, and not sit down and say, Do you prove the contrary, or else I'll take it.——But if you can carry this argument no farther, it's time to proceed to another.

Ruf. So I design, if there be no answer given.

Chan. Here is an answer. I deny the Minor.

Ruf. I have prov'd it, according to the Judgment of all present.

Leigh, According to the Judgment of those that understand the rules of Disputation, you ought to prove the Negative. But we will undertake to prove, that there is that recorded in Scripture which will prove by just Consequence what you deny.

Rob. If you will change sides you may.

Ruf.

Ruſ. This is no changing ſides: For I do not deſign to quit the Opponency, only let him bring an inſtance.*

Leigh. I would beg one favour, *i. e.* the offering a few words. I'll undertake in any Diſputation, Philoſophical or Divine, by this method, to turn the Opponency on the Reſpondent. I'll but make him bring one Proof of what he ſays, and this way, immediately turn the Opponency on him.——And as for this, Here's a Gentleman that underſtands the Rules of Diſputation.——I deſire, Sir, you would declare whether Mr. *Ruſſel*, be not oblig'd to prove the Negative he hath aſſerted.

Dr. *Smith.* According to the Rules of Diſputation. *Negantis non eſt probare.**

Ruſ. Well, what muſt I do?

Rob. Sir, you are to prove your Propoſition. Here is this worthy Gentleman of the ſame mind.

Ruſ. How do you mean prove? The whole Current of Scripture ſufficiently proves it. The total ſilence of Scripture in this matter is Proof; What is not in Scripture, *&c.*

Rob. If you can proceed no farther upon this, then it's time you go on.

Arg. 2. *Ruſ.* If Infants are not capable to be made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men, then they cannot poſſibly be the Subjects of Baptiſm intended in Chriſt's Commiſſion. But they are not capable to be made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men. Therefore, *&c.*

Chan. Here if you mean by Diſciples, Actual and Compleat Diſciples, then I deny your *Major*. But if you mean Incompleat Diſciples, ſuch as are entred into a School in order to be inſtructed, and given up in order to learn there, I deny the *Minor*

Ruſ. The *Major* is this. If Infants are not capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men, then they cannot poſſibly be the Subjects of Baptiſm.

Chand.

* *The Drs. deſign even now was to turn the Opponency on us, as I can prove from a Letter of Mr.* Jo. Williams. *But now he will not quit the Opponency, and yet expects from us a Scripture Proof for Infant Baptiſm.*

* *Or,* Aſſerenti incumbit probatio.

Chand. Well then. As to your Major. That they that are not capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men, are not capable Subjects of Baptiſm. Diſtinguiſh between Compleat and Incompleat Diſciples.

* *Here we expected that the Dr. ſhould either have ſhewn that this diſtinction is groundleſs, or that he ſhould have brought it into his next Syllogiſm. But he doth neither.*

Ruf. What doth he mean by denying my Major?

Rob. Mr. *Chandler* diſtinguiſhes between Compleat and Incompleat Diſciples. If you mean Compleat Diſciples, he denys the *Major*. If you mean Incompleat Diſciples, he denys the *Minor*.

Ruf. Well, come, Tell me what he means by Compleat and Incompleat Diſciples, by the Miniſtry of Men?

Chand. I mean by Compleat Diſciples, ſuch as are actually capable of Learning; by Incompleat, ſuch particularly, as are enter'd into the School of Chriſt in order to their future Learning, as we ſend Children to School before they are capable of Learning one Letter.

Ruf. I do not talk of that, I ſpeak of their being actually capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men.

Chand. I deny that thoſe, that are capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men *in your ſenſe*, are the only Subjects of Baptiſm. That's what you are to prove.

* *We ſeeing that the Dr. wav'd diſtinctions, and grounded his Diſcipleſhip by the Miniſtry of Men upon the word* Teach, Mat. 28. 19. *And that becauſe it goes before the Word* Baptizing. *Therefore we denied the* Major.

Ruf. Well, if that be the thing you deny, you deny the Conſequence. And I prove it thus. If our Lord in the Commiſſion which he hath given for Holy Baptiſm hath required his Diſciples and Apoſtles, who were Men, to make thoſe Diſciples by their Miniſtry who were to be Baptized, then my Conſequence is true. But our Lord in the Commiſſion hath, *&c.* Therefore.

Chand. *I deny the* Minor. *He hath not Commanded all that were to be Baptized by the Apoſtles, firſt to be made Diſci-*

Diſciples by their Miniſtry in your ſenſe; I think here ought to be a diſtinction. Perſons may have a right to publick viſible entrance into the Church of God, before they are compleat Diſciples; that, we ſay, Infants have before Baptiſm, and ſo in a more imperfect ſenſe are Diſciples, but in a more perfect ſenſe are made ſo by Baptiſm.

Ruſ. We are talking whether Infants are capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men.

Leigh. We ſay, that as they are the Infants of believers, ſo they are in a more imperfect ſenſe really Diſciples before Baptiſm. And it's nothing, to talk of their being made ſuch by the Miniſtry of Men.

Will. If they are ſuch, then it is by the Miniſtry of Men.

Leigh. That I deny, *Knowing that you Ground your Aſſertion upon the poſition of* Teach *before* Baptize, Mat. 28. 19.

Ruſ. Our Saviour hath joyn'd Diſcipling and Baptizing together. They are commanded firſt to make Diſciples, and then to baptize them. Therefore, I ſay, if Infants are not capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of men, they are not, according to this Commiſſion, to be baptized.

Chan. Prove that *.

Ruſ. If Infants have no Knowledge to diſcern between Good and Evil, then they are not capable to be made Diſciples by the miniſtry of men. But they have no Knowledge, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

* Mr. *Chandler* calls for a Proof of the Conſequent, and the Ly. goes upon the Proof of the Antecedent.

Chan. Here you trick all this while. I told you, by Diſciples I meant incompleat ones, and ſuch as are given up in order to be inſtructed in the School of Chriſt. *I require you to prove that theſe ought not to be baptized, becauſe not capable of Inſtruction by the Miniſtry of Men.*

Ruſ. What do I care what you mean: we are ſpeaking of the Commiſſion of Chriſt.

Will. The Scripture ſays they muſt be Diſciples according to the Commiſſion.

Ruſ. We are talking of the Prerequiſites to Baptiſm: Therefore it's plain, according to what I have told you,

and the Argument is expreſs and full, according to the words of the Text, that they muſt be made Diſciples by the miniſtry of men, if they be to be baptized: For in *Mark* Chriſt commiſſioneth *to go into all the World, and preach the Goſpel to every Creature.* In *Mat.* 28. they were to Diſciple all Nations, and then to baptize them. Now if Infants be not capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of men, then they are not capable Subjects of Baptiſm. Now you denied this Conſequence of the *Major*, which I proved thus *. If Infants have no Knowledge to diſcern between good and evil, then they are not capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of men. But, *&c.*

* *Here the Dr. blunders again, confounding Antecedent and Conſequent.*

Rob. By his former diſtinction he denies both Antecedent and Conſequent.

Chan. I deny your Conſequence with my former Diſtinction †.

† i. e. *Becauſe they are not capable of Inſtruction, or compleat Diſcipleſhip by the Miniſtry of men; therefore that they are not to be baptized.*

Ruſ. Then you ſay, tho they have no knowledge, yet ſtill they are capable of being made Diſciples by the miniſtry of men *.

* *Here is not a word of the Conſequence, which is ſtill deny'd; but he goes on upon the Antecedent.*

Chan. I only deſire a Syllogiſm.

Rob. You induſtriouſly ſeek to hide your meaning. If you mean by Diſciples ſuch as are ſo in the fulleſt and compleateſt Senſe, Prove that all muſt be made ſuch, in order to their being baptized. But if you mean Diſciples in the loweſt Senſe, as it intends ſuch as are given up in order to be inſtructed in the School of Chriſt, prove that Infants are not capable of being made ſuch Diſciples. This Mr. *Chandler's* Diſtinction puts upon you. We do not know what you mean.

Ruſ. The Argument is ſo plain, that I doubt not but any body of underſtanding may know what I mean; therefore it's ſtrange that Mr. *Chandler*, *Leigh*, *Robinſon*, do not underſtand me.

Leigh. We know there is a double ſenſe of the word, and accordingly we deny either Antecedent or Conſequent.

Chan. You will not allow the diſtinction of *Compleat* or *Incompleat* Diſciples, *nor yet ſhew it to be groundleſs.*

Ruſ. Fix upon ſomething.

Chand.

Chan. I told you before, If in your Argument, by Diſciples you mean *Incompleat ones*, I deny your *Minor*. But if *Compleat ones*, I deny the Conſequence of your *Major*.

Leigh. Give a direct anſwer according to this diſtinction; i. e. *Either prove that Infants are not Incompleat Diſciples, or that they are not to be baptized, becauſe but Incompleat*; i. e. *not capable of Inſtruction by the Miniſtry of men.*

Ruſ. Have Infants any knowledge?

Chan. No, not in actual exerciſe.

Ruſ. Then I proceed. If the Goſpel, in the miniſtration of it, was appointed to inform men what is good and what is evil, and Infants have no knowledge to diſcern between good and evil, then Infants are not capable of being made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of men *.

Leigh. You ought to add (Incompleat).

Ruſ. What doth he mean by Incompleat Diſciples?

Here Mr. *Chandler* is forc't to explain his diſtinction, as before.

* *He takes no notice at all of the diſtinction, but goes on to prove that Infants can't be compleat Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men.*

Ruſ. You forget we are ſpeaking according to the Commiſſion.

Chand. No I don't. I ſay, *&c.* As before.

Ruſ. Then by Compleat you mean ſuch as are Actually Diſciples.

Leigh. A Compleat Diſciple is one actually capable of Learning. An Incompleat, is one given up as aforeſaid in order to Learn. And we appeal to the whole Auditory, whether or no, a child of two years old thus devoted to Learning by the Reſignation of the Parent and Acceptation of the Maſter, is not juſtly in an imperfect ſenſe deem'd a Schollar?

Ruſ. Infants Schollars! Very mean Schollars indeed, not capable of Learning one word.

Leigh. I believe here is a Gentleman who teaches School. Sir, I would fain know whether no one may be accounted a Schollar, but he that is actually capable of Learning?

Mr. *Ridge School-Maſter.* I take all to be Diſciples in my School, provided entrance Money be paid, * whether they Learn or not.

* *Here followed a General Laughter.*

Ruſ. I muſt appeal to theſe Honourable Perſons, whether or no I did not tell Mr. *Chandler*, Compleat Diſciples, ſuch as are made by the Miniſtry of Men? What's the meaning of all this Noiſe about ſuch little Children, do you think?

Rob. Prove what Mr. *Chandler* deny's.

Ruſ. Let me know, what Mr. *Chandler* deny's. You ſay that they have no Knowledge, and that they are not Compleat Diſciples, the conſequence then is, that they are not intended in the Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28. *Mar.* 16. *

* *This is the Conſequence that hath been ſtill deny'd, and no Proof offer'd.*

Chand. Put it into a Syllogiſm.

Ruſ. There's no need of putting it into a Syllogiſm: For you have granted all the Parts of my Argument. Yes, every Part. You have granted. (1.) That Infants have no Knowledge to diſcern between good and evil. You have in the (2.) Place granted, that according to my Argument they are not capable of being made Compleat Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men. The Conſequence then is, that they are not at all intended in the Commiſſion. *

* *But the Dr. ought to have proved, either, that there are no Incompleat Diſciples, or that they are excluded from the Commiſſion for Baptiſm, becauſe they have no Knowledge, &c.*

Rob. It's a moſt falſe thing you inſinuate to the People, and what you your ſelf cannot but know to be falſe. For that the Conſequence, which, you would perſwade the People, Mr. *Chandler* allows, is what he hath all along deny'd. And if you can't prove it, pray proceed to another Argument.

Arg. 3. *Ruſ.* If the Apoſtle *Paul* did declare all the Councel of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God, and yet did never declare the Baptiſm of infants to be an Inſtitution of Chriſt, Then Infant Baptiſm is not according to the Commiſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. But the Apoſtle *Paul* did declare all the Councel of God, and kept back nothing, *&c.* And yet did never declare the Baptiſm of Infants, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

Leigh. Your Argument is very long. I deny that the Apoſtle *Paul* never ſpoke of Infant Baptiſm, which is part

part of your Minor. Prove that the Apoſtle *Paul* never did declare the Baptiſm of Infants.

Ruſ. If the Apoſtle *Paul* hath ſo declared it, then it's ſome where to be be found in the Writings of the new Teſtament. But it's no where to be found in the Writings of the New Teſtament. Therefore *&c.*

Leigh. I deny the conſequence of your *Major*. *For Paul might declare it, tho' the new Teſtament ſhould not diſcover* that he did; the Text you quote relates to the Church of *Epheſus*. And we have not the whole of the Apoſtles Sermons to them, no, not the hundredth part of them, he being among them for the ſpace of two years. Now you muſt prove that this refer's to that Epiſtle he hath left upon record to the *Epheſians*. *Thus being all that is left to poſterity in Holy Writ of ſeveral hundred Sermons that he preach'd to that Church, wherein he might ſpeak often of Infant Baptiſm, tho' it be not mention'd in this ſhort Epiſtle.*

Ruſ. You then acknowledge, that it's no where recorded in the New Teſtament.

Leigh. I deny that the Apoſtle did write the whole New Teſtament. And then, Would you confine what *Paul* is there ſaid to have declared to the Church of *Epheſus*, *To what is left on record, Viz.*, that particular Epiſtle we find inſcrib'd to them? He had ſpoken to the Church of *Epheſus* all the Councel of God, but we cannot ſuppoſe all that he deliver'd to them in 2 years to be contain'd within the compaſs of one ſhort Epiſtle, containing but ſix Chapters.

Ruſ. Is all the Councel, that the Apoſtle *Paul* wrote, in the New Teſtament? Is there any Commiſſion for Infant Baptiſm in the whole New Teſtament? Do you think you ſpeak any thing to me? I hope you'll own that the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament are the only rule to direct us how we may ſerve and glorify God.

Leigh. Yes, that I will.

Ruſ. I refer you to that Scripture and you run to a certain ſort of ſuppoſition, *&c.* *—— I am not talking of any Sermons that are not in the Scripture, but of what is in the Scripture. The words

* *Here the Dr. neither deny's that* Paul *did declare the Baptiſm of Infants in his Sermons, nor aſſerts that all he Preached is left on record.*

are

are plain, Acts 20. 20. *I have kept back nothing that was profitable for you, and* v. 27. *I have not ſhunned to declare unto you the whole Councel of God.* And again, 1 Cor. 4. 17. He Declares, *that his ways in Chriſt were ſuch as he taught every where in every Church.* I do not ſuppoſe that the Apoſtle *Paul* taught one Doctrine at one place, and another at another. Now if he never taught this Doctrine to the Church of *Epheſus*, nor to none elſe, I hope that then you'll acknowledge (ſince it's not to be found in the Writings of the New Teſtament) that he never declared the Baptiſm of Infants.

Leigh. I utterly deny it, becauſe in the Writings of the New Teſtament, are not all the Sermons that *Paul* Preached.

Ruſ. I ſay this, if you'll declare before this People, that there is no Account that *Paul* did ever declare this in any of the Writings of the New Teſtament, It's ſufficient; ſuppoſing the thing granted, that *Pauls* Epiſtles are not the whole of what he Preached. That's nothing to us, I ſuppoſe the People will not look any where elſe.

If *Paul* ſo declared it, then it's * ſomewhere to be found in the Writings of the New Teſtament. But It's no where to be found, *&c.*

Leigh. I utterly deny the Conſequence.

Ruſ. Then if it be any where in the New Teſtament, Mr. *Chandler*, Mr. *Leigh*, or ſome other Perſon is able to ſhew it. But neither, *&c.* *

Leigh. I ſay, 'tis included in the Words, *All Nations*, *Mat.* 28. The Commiſſion. *

Ruſ. Is Mr. *Chandler* of your mind. I tell you in my Argument, that it's not any where recorded in the New Teſtament, that *Paul* had thus declared the Baptiſm of Infants. And I deny that the Commiſſion of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, tells you, that *Paul* did declare it.

* *This Word* It's *may either refer to* Pauls *Declaration, or to Baptiſm. And this ambiguity caus'd ſome confuſion afterwards.*

* *Here the Dr. was to prove the Conſequent, and he goes on to prove the Antecedent.*

* *The Dr. would ramble and we rather follow than leave him. And gave the Words* (All Nations) *ſuppoſing by the Word* (It) *he meant Baptiſm.*

Leigh.

Leigh. I Anſwer, that *Paul* might have declared the Baptiſm of Infants an hundred times over, and yet it might not be left on record in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians, Nor any part of the New Teſtament that he did ſo.*

Rob. That's the Conſequence you are now to prove. Becauſe it's not left on record in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, that therefore he never declared it to the Church of *Epheſus.*

Ruſ. I have neither *Epheſus* nor *Pauls* Epiſtles in my Arguments, yet you tell me.——*Here was a general murmuring at the Drs. evaſions, the weakneſs whereof was obvious to the Auditory.*

Leigh. I'll beg a little ſilence. And firſt read what this Gentleman Quotes, (*Acts* 20.)——The Apoſtle tells the Church of *Epheſus*, he had not ſhunned to declare to them the whole Council of God. From hence he concludes, (*Without Proof*) *that all that* Paul *had declared to them was written and left on record; and becauſe the Baptiſm of Infants doth not ſtand on record, as being part of what he declar'd to the Church of* Epheſus, *therefore that he never did declare it. Remember.* To the Church of *Epheſus* he ſpeaks. Now of all the whole Councel of God, which he is ſaid to have declared to them, there is but one Epiſtle containing ſix ſhort Chapters left upon record. *Can this ſhort record contain all the Sermons that he Preached to them in two Years? Or dare any ſay, that he never declared to them the Baptiſm of Infants in two years Sermons and Diſcourſes, becauſe it's not contained in this ſhort record?* And ſo I have done.

Ruſ. But I have not done with you, the Apoſtle *Paul* is the Perſon under conſideration, and mention'd in my Argument, as one that did declare the whole Councel of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for them. *

* *Who doubts this, And what is it to the purpoſe?*

Leigh. The Church of the *Epheſians.* Pray remember that.

Ruſ. The Queſtion under conſideration and my Argument is of one that did declare the whole Councel of God. And that the Apoſtle *Paul* did ſo, I prove, *Acts* 20. 20. Compared with *v.* 27. *I have kept back nothing that was profitable for you, but have ſhewed*

you

you and taught, &c. Testifying to *Jews* and *Greeks*, &c. v. 26. He doth not only say, *That he was pure from the Blood of these* Ephesians, *but from the Blood of all Men.* For v. 27. *I have not shunned to declare to you.* I do say, that in this Text, *Paul* doth solemnly declare that he had declared all the Councel of God, and I do say, that *Paul* was faithful. I believe *Paul* was as faithful, as laborious a Servant and Steward of Jesus Christ, as ever Christ had in the World. And I argue. If *Paul* did never declare the Baptism of Infants to be a Gospel Institution, then, I tell you, there can be no such thing. The *Major* is proved from the Words of the Text. The other I prove by a Syllogism, that if he declare it, it is somewhere so recorded in the New Testament. But it is, *&c.* *

* *Remember he doth not mention any here to whom he had declared the Councel*, &c. *but the* Ephesians. *He mentions* Jews *and* Greeks, *because there were* Greeks *or* Hellenists *at* Ephesus, *and many other places up and down, as well as* Jews.

And we don't Question but he did declare the whole Councel, &c. *and therefore Infant Baptism; but say it's not necessary to be left on record, as Preach'd by* Paul, *especially to these* Ephesians, *when there is other good Scripture Proof for it.*

But the Dr. makes a long harangue only to bring over his own Argument again, which he could not make good.

Chand. I deny both your Antecedent and Consequent.

Leigh. Here, Pray observe it Gentlemen, *Greeks* and *Jews* were in *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, and various places where *Paul* planted Churches. And [*all Men*] *very often signifies all sorts of Men. And* Paul *speaks still to these Ephesians, among whom were* Jews *and* Greeks, *all sorts of Men. And tho' it be a certain truth that* Paul *was pure from the blood of all Men, yet* all *may here be understood with Limitation, and so it may not be evident from this Text.*

Ruf. Did *Paul* ever speak one word of Infant Baptism.

Chan. If *Paul* did not, *in what is on record to the Ephesians*, what then? We deny the consequence of the Argument. That because *Paul* says he had declar'd the whole Councel of God to the Church of *Ephesus*, among whom he Preached for 2 years, and yet doth not mention Infant Baptism in his Epistle left

left upon record to them, that therefore he did never ſpeak of it to them, nor none elſewhere.

Ruſ. I am bound to anſwer here. If there are any other writings of *Paul* that are not contain'd in the New Teſtament, and you can produce them, then you ſay ſomething to the purpoſe.

Rob. Becauſe this is what Mr. *Reſpondent* puts upon you to prove, unleſs you prove that you prove nothing: That, tho' *Paul* did not ſhun to declare the whole Council of God; and did not declare Infant Baptiſm in his Epiſtle to the Church of *Epheſus*, therefore he did not declare it in his Sermons to them.

Arg. 4. *Ruſ.* Chriſt's Commiſſion doth ſhew who are to be Baptized. But it doth not ſhew that Infants are to be Baptized; Therefore Infants are not to be Baptized according to the Commiſſion of our Lord.

Chan. I deny your *Minor*. That it doth not ſhew that Infants are to be Baptized.

Ruſ. If the Commiſſion of our Lord doth ſhew that Infants are to be Baptized, then Mr. *Chandler*, Mr. *Leigh*, or ſome body elſe is able to ſhew it. But neither Mr. *Chandler* &c. Therefore &c.

Chand. It's included in the words, (*All Nations.*)

Ruſ. I prove it againſt you that Infants are not included in the words (*All Nations*) For if Infants then all Infants would be ſo. But you only allow Infants of believing parents.

Leigh. The force of this Argument is this. That unleſs we will Baptize all of all Nations we muſt Baptize none of any Nation.

Ruſ. No it it is not.

Leigh. I ſay they are included in the words (*All Nations*) you muſt prove that they are not. And firſt of all, Gentlemen, I will appeal to you, Is it, in a Religious ſenſe, improper to ſay, the whole Nation (ſuppoſe) of *Paleſtine* are *Mahumetans*, and ſo conſequently, that their little Children are Young *Mahumetans*.

Chan. You muſt prove that all Infants are excluded from the words (*All Nations.*)

Ruſ. Would you have me then ſhew you that there is a Limitation in the words (*All Nations.*)

Leigh. The Point ly's here. If he will invalidate my Answer, he must shew, that, because all Nations are to be Baptized, and infants are included in the words *All Nations*, therefore it follows, that all Infants are to be Baptized.

Ruf. Therefore, if I shew there is a Limitation I take away the force of the Argument, and this I do, by Mr. *Chandler's* confuting himself. *

* *Here our Scribes were imperfect and I cannot Remember what ought to be inserted. But the force of the Argument is not removed.*

Leigh. I deny your *Minor*, That Christ hath not included Infants in this Commission.

Ruf. If those that Christ hath commanded to be Baptized must be disciples, then Infants are not included in this Commission. But those, *&c.* Therefore.

Leigh. I deny your Consequence.

Ruf. I prove it thus. If there are no others Express'd in this Commission, then they are not included. But no others are Express'd. Therefore.

Leigh. They are implyed. The good consequence of the Commission I insist upon. I say there is no Necessity for all the Subjects, included in this Commission, to be Disciples in the fullest and compleatest sense.

Ruf. All those that are required to be Baptized by Christs Commission are Disciples. But Infants are not capable to be made Disciples. Therefore *&c.*

Leigh. I deny your whole Argument, and first your *Major*.

Ruf. If there are no other express'd in Christs Commission, Then my *Major* is true.

Leigh. They are imply'd. You know you allowed good consequence but now.

Ruf. We are talking of a Commission, good Sir.

Leigh. I hope we are talking of good consequence from a Commission. That which I assert is this. That all are not to be Compleat Disciples, before Baptized, or, That they are not to be actually taught.

Ruf. I know not what you mean by * Compleat Disciples; A Person may be a Disciple twenty years before he be a Compleat one.

* *How many times hath the Dr. been told what we mean by Compleat Disciples!*

I

If our Lord requires none to be Baptized by the Commiſſion, but ſuch as he commands to be made Diſciples before he commands them to be Baptized, then what I ſay is true. But our Lord requires none, *&c.* Therefore,

Leigh. I deny your *Minor*.

Ruſ. I'll read the Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28. 18, 19, 20. And Jeſus came and ſpake to them ſaying, *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and Earth. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, Baptizing them,* &c. *Teaching them to obſerve all things, &c.* This Commiſſion is very ſolemnly given, *&c.* In this Commiſſion our Lord doth firſt of all declare the great Power that was, *&c. Here the Dr. was going on with a large harangue.*

Rob. Pray Mr. *Ruſſel*, do not Preach us a Sermon, but bring us an Argument from the Words.

Ruſ. I thought Mr. *Leigh* had brought the Commiſſion for an inſtance, we are now coming to examine, *&c.*

Leigh. Pray form your Syllogiſm.

Chand. Pray do.

Ruſ. I ſay, in this Commiſſion our Lord doth firſt of all declare, *&c. He is going on again with his harangue.*

Rob. It's not a Sermon, but an Argument from the Commiſſion, *&c.*

Ruſ. What, will you not allow me to read my Maſters Commiſſion? *Here in ſpight of us all, he would go on with his tedious dictates.*

Ruſ. I argue thus from this Commiſſion. If there be an expreſs command for the Baptizing ſome Perſons in Chriſts Commiſſion, and there be no expreſs command, neither there nor elſewhere in the Holy Scriptures, for the Baptizing of Infants, then the Baptiſm of Infants is not contain'd in this Commiſſion. But there is an expreſs command, *&c.* Therefore,

Leigh. Pray obſerve it, whereas good Conſequence was but now allowed with great difficulty, now it's deny'd. He requires an expreſs command. To this I anſwer. If Nations do include Infants, then there is a plain command.

Chand. We deny the Conſequence of your *Major*, and then we deny your *Minor*.

* *And thus to ſpend time, he will have his long Argument over again.*

Ruſ. My Argument was this. * If there be an expreſs command in Chriſts Commiſſion, *&c.* They deny the ſequel of my *Major*, and by thus denying do ſay, that, notwithſtanding there be no expreſs command for the Baptizing of Infants, neither in the Commiſſion, nor any where elſe in the Holy Scripture, yet they do tell us by this denial, that they may be included in the Commiſſion.

Rob. Here is a ſophiſm; ſays he, if it be neither in the Commiſſion, nor any where elſe in the Holy Scriptures, then it is not in the Commiſſion.

Ruſ. If there be an expreſs command for the Baptizing of ſome Perſons in Chriſts Commiſſion, and there be no expreſs command for the Baptizing of Infants, then Infants are not at all intended in Chriſts Commiſſion. But, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

Leigh. Firſt, I deny the ſequel of the *Major*, and then I deny the *Minor*.

Ruſ. It ſeems very ſtrange, that you do deny this, and I will endeavour to prove it. Here is an expreſs command for ſome Perſons to be Baptized, here is no expreſs command for the Baptizing of Infants; is it not then a neceſſary conſequence that they are not included in the Commiſſion? *

* *An excellent Proof, i. e. turning the concluſion into a queſtion.*

Leigh. I deny both Parts, and firſt your *Major*.

* *Obſerve, he falls upon the* Minor. *Not a Word of the* Major.

Ruſ. I ſhall prove it thus. *That there is an expreſs command for Baptizing ſome Perſons, the Commiſſion it ſelf proves.

Leigh. It's the ſequel of the *Major* I deny. Pray prove that.

Ruſ. Then you do ſay, That, notwithſtanding our Lord hath expreſly commanded ſome Perſons to be Baptized in the Commiſſion, and hath not expreſly commanded Infants, yet they may be ſome of the Number. Hath Chriſt two ſorts of Subjects, one that he doth expreſly command to be Baptized, and another that he doth not command?

Leigh.

Leigh. Put your Proof of the ſequel of the *Major* into a Syllogiſm.

Ruſ. We are upon the Commiſſion.

Leigh. I ſay, Prove the conſequence of your *Major.*

Ruſ. If no perſon be to be baptiz'd but what is expreſly required to be ſo by Chriſt's Commiſſion, then the conſequence of the Major is true; i. e. *That the Baptiſm of Infants is not contained in the Commiſſion.* But no perſon is to be baptized, *&c.* Therefore.

Leigh. I deny your Minor.

Ruſ. That which I am to prove is this, That there are no perſons to be baptized but what are expreſly required in the Commiſſion. I prove it thus. If the words of the Commiſſion are an expreſs command to the Apoſtles of our Lord, to direct them whom they ſhould baptize, then the Minor is true. But the words of the Commiſſion are, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

Leigh. I deny your Minor.

Ruſ. If there be no other Commiſſion of our Lord and Saviour J. C. for holy Baptiſm, but what is recorded *Mat.* 28. *Mar.* 16. then the Minor is true. But there is no other, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

Leigh. I deny the ſequel of the Major.

Ruſ. We are now upon the Commiſſion.

Leigh. That we are; and we ſay, That whatever by good conſequence is fairly deducible from the Commiſſion, is the true ſenſe of it.

Ruſ. They are not to baptize any but ſuch as they are expreſly commanded ſo to do.

Leigh. I deny it.

Ruſ. If there be no manner of allowance given them to baptize any other than whom they are expreſly commanded, then the conſequence of the Major is true. But there is no manner of allowance, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

Leigh. Now I deny your Minor.

Ruſ. I ſhall recur to my former Argument. If there be an expreſs command in the Commiſſion to the Apoſtles, for the Baptiſm of all ſuch as they are required to baptize by vertue of that Commiſſion, then my Minor is true. But, *&c. Here follows a vacancy in the Notes of our Scribes.*

R. If for all thoſe they are to baptize by vertue of the Commiſſion, they are to have an expreſs command from Chriſt

ſo

ſo to do, then there is no allowance in the Commiſſion to baptize any other perſon. But for all thoſe they are required to baptize, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

Chand. I deny the Minor.

Leigh. I diſtinguiſh between the command's being expreſt, and the Subjects of it.

Chand. Prove that all the Subjects are expreſt.

Ruſ. If the words in the Commiſſion, about holy Baptiſm, be a command of Chriſt to the Apoſtles *, then my Minor is true. But they are a command, *&c.* Therefore.

* *Here the Dr. waves the diſtinction, that he may wrap up himſelf and the Auditory in confuſion.*

Leigh. We allow it's a command, but deny that all the Subjects are expreſt. I ſay, I allow the command to be expreſs, but deny that all the Subjects are expreſt; ſome are taken in by good conſequence.

Ruſ. If Chriſt hath commanded his Apoſtles to Baptize ſuch as do believe and are made Diſciples, then ſuch are to be Baptized. But *&c*: Therefore *&c.*

L. I find, in the firſt place, a fault with your *Syllogiſm*. *The Major* ought to be Univerſal. Whereas it is, ſuch as do believe are the Subjects of Baptiſm; It ought to be, Such are the only, or all the Subjects of Baptiſm; *and thus, in the Second Place, I deny the Sequel.*

Will. Then I am to prove that Believers only are intended. If Believers are the only Perſons that are included in the Commiſſion, then no other perſons are. But Believers are the only *&c*: Therefore.

L. I deny your *Minor*.

W. I will prove it in Mark 16. laſt. He that believeth is Baptized, *&c.* Hence I Argue that Believers are the only Subjects to be Baptized.

L. To this I Anſwer, Firſt. If Previous Actual Believing be made Univerſally Neceſſary to Baptiſm, it is much more ſo to Salvation, and Conſequently no Infant can be ſaved, *For the following words are he that Believeth not ſhall be damned.*

Ruſ. I do not affirm any ſuch thing, I would rather ſay that all Infants dying in their Infancy are Elect, and ſo ſaved, the contrary to which I believe Mr. *Chandler* cannot prove *.

* *Here the Dr. ſeems willing to turn off the Diſputation, to Original Sin, which thoſe of his Profeſſion deny.*

L. Yes

L. Yes, we know your Opinion about this well enough. *I have your Confession in my Pocket.* But if you will assert that actual believing is necessary to Baptism, then 'tis so to Salvation; for it follows, *he that believeth not shall be damned.*

Wil. If believers are the only Subjects of Baptism, according to the Commission, then Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism: but Believers are the only Subjects, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

L. I deny your Minor.

Wil. Then pray shew me where any others are in the Commission.

L. In the words (*all Nations*).

Wil. In the words (*all Nations*)? No, say I, It's all Nations so modified. It's all Nations discipled.

L. I deny it. *This is not evident from this Text.*

Wil. Go, disciple unto me all Nations, baptizing them. The word *them* is relative to *all Nations discipled.* If therefore there be none but believers, and such as are taught in the Commission, then Infants are not in the Commission. But there are none but believers, *&c.*

L. I deny your Minor.

Wil. If Infants are not capable of being taught, then they are no Disciples. But they are not, *&c.* Therefore.

L. I deny it, i. e. *the Sequel.*

Wil. If Infants are uncapable of learning Jesus Christ, then they are uncapable of being discipled unto Christ. But, *&c.*

L. I deny the consequence of your Major; That because they are uncapable of learning Christ, therefore they are uncapable of being Discipled to Christ.

Will. I say, If Infants are not the Subjects in the Commission *, neither are capable of being taught and instructed, then they are not the Subjects of Baptism. But, *&c*: Therefore, *&c.*

* *Here's a Fallacy; he will now suppose his own conclusion, and the Sum of what we deny'd before.*

L. I deny that they are not the Subjects. And the *Greek* word signify's to make Disciples. I deny that they are uncapable of being made Disciples, because not capable of learning.

Wil.

Wil. If to be a Diſciple of Chriſt is to be a Schollar of Chriſt, then Infants that are uncapable of Learning Chriſt can be no Diſciples. But, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

L. I deny ſtill the Sequel of the *Major.*

Will If he that hath learn't nothing is no Schollar, then becauſe they are not capable of learning Jeſus Chriſt, They are no Scholars of Chriſt. But, *&c.* Therefore *&c.*

L. I appeal to all here preſent, Whether they do not count that child an *Incompleat* Schollar, that is reſigned by the Parent and accepted by the Maſter, tho' it hath not learn'd any thing. And now I deny your *Minor.*

Wil. Tell me where Chriſt's School is for teaching Infants, and who is Chriſt's School-Maſter?

L. Jeſus Chriſt himſelf is the School-Maſter.

Wil. Jeſus Chriſt is the great School-Maſter, but his Miniſters are appointed to make Diſciples by teaching. Now you ſay a Child is a Diſciple as ſoon as he goes to School.

L. I ſay, the reſignation of the Parent, and the acceptation of the Maſter, conſtitutes the Relation.

Wil. If he that hath been at School, and taught by his own conſent, muſt appear to be a Scholar of Chriſt by his having actually learn'd, before he be baptized, then Infants that are entred, according to your ſaying, muſt not be baptized. But he that hath been at School, *&c.* Therefore.

L. I deny your conſequence.

Wil. I prove it thus. The *Eunuch* was content to be taught *; *Philip* teacheth him: Yet afterward he muſt know whether he believed, before he baptized him. Therefore Infants, entred according to your ſaying, muſt not be baptized, becauſe they are not content to be taught, *&c*: And *Eraſmus*, tho' he was none of the beſt of Men yet he was accounted a great Schollar in his day, he reads it, *When they have learned dip thou them.*

* *He was here to prove the Conſequence, and he brings an Inſtance to prove the Antecedent and but barely aſſerts the Conſequent.*

L. Here are two things that this old Gentleman argues from, the firſt is, The Inſtance of the *Eunuch.* The Second is, The Authority of *Eraſmus.*

Will. Not from his Authority, but Judgment *.

* *What is a man's Authority in this caſe but his Judgment?*

Rob.

Rob. Did *Eraſmus* write in *Engliſh*? You ſay, you do not underſtand *Latin*.

Wil. In *Engliſh*. *Here the people brake out into a great Laughter.*

Rnſ. Is *Eraſmus* in your eſteem ſo mean a Schollar, that there muſt be ſuch Laughing at the old Gentleman's mentioning the Name of *Eraſmus*?*

L. Well, but as to the firſt thing; you argue from the Inſtance of the Eunuch; The Eunuch was a Proſelyte of the Gate, and a grown perſon, and therefore *Philip* deals with him as ſuch. Now, according to the *Jewiſh* Law, a Proſelyte's Infant was to be taken into their Church, as the Infant of an home-born Inhabitant*. And becauſe *Philip* requires of him a Profeſſion of his Faith, ſuppoſe he had had an Infant in the Chariot, muſt that be denied Baptiſm, and ſo lookt upon as the Infant of a Pagan, *and be ſhut out of viſible Church-memberſhip, which he enjoyed before? Did his Parents Faith deprive him of Church-memberſhip?* Then as to *Eraſmus*, he was an Interpendent between a *Papiſt* and *Proteſtant*; and many of theſe Gentlemen, in their great Zeal againſt Infant-baptiſm, will call it a peice of Popery, and yet can make uſe of *the Name of an Half-Papiſt when it ſerves their Cauſe.*

* *The people Laughed not becauſe* Eraſmus's *name was mentioned, but becauſe he ſaid* Eraſmus *wrote in* Engliſh.

* *Mr.* Leigh *ſince the Diſputation, hath acknowledg'd himſelf guilty of a miſtake, in calling the Eunuch a* Proſelyte of the Gate; *whereas he was probably of the Church, and ſuch a ones Infants were accounted Church-Members. But the Dr. had not the ſenſe to diſcover this miſtake.*

Wil. If the Adminiſtrator muſt have an account of the Subjects Learning, before he be baptiz'd, then Infants are not the Subjects of Baptiſm. But he muſt, *&c.* Therefore.

L. I deny your Minor, That he that adminiſters the Ordinance muſt always have an account of the Subjects Learning.

Wil. I will prove it firſt by that of *Philip*: *If thou believeſt with all thine heart, thou mayeſt.* The contrary whereunto is, *If thou doſt not, thou mayeſt not.* Again, *Mat.* 28. *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* The word is re-

lative to all Nations discipled. They must have an account whether they are Disciples or not. This is the Antecedent.

L. All Nations?

Wil. Nay, all Nations Discipled.

L. So you say. But prove it. What! perhaps you think that *All Nations* cannot be the Antecedent to *Them*; because τὰ ἔθνη is the *Neuter Gender*, and αὐτὸς is the *Masculine*.

Ruf. Yes, αὐτὸς is of the *Masculine Gender*, and μαθητεύσατε is of the *Masculine Gender*, and agrees with αὐτὸς.

Rob. I thought μαθητεύσατε had been a Verb.

Ruf. I answer to what he says; he says that αὐτὸς is of the *Masculine Gender*, and I say so, and that μαθητεύσατε is of the same Gender, and agrees with αὐτὸς.

L. I suppose Mr. *Russel* thinks he is got among his *Hebrew* Verbs. They, notwithstanding, refer each to other, tho τὰ ἔθνη be of the *Neuter*, and αὐτὸς of the *Masculine Gender*. For a Boy of 12 years of age, that hath lookt into the *Greek*, can tell you that such a *Syntheſis* is frequently to be met with in the *Greek*.

Wil. If Infants are uncapable of denying themselves for Christ, then they are uncapable of being Disciples to Christ. But, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

L. *I* deny the sequel of the Major.

Will. I prove it out of *Luke* 14. If he doth not deny himself, he cannot be Christ's Disciple.

L. This purely refers to the adult. And I will argue *ab abſurdo*. * If any work not let him not eat, but Infants cannot * work, therefore they must not eat. *But both one Text, and the other refer to the adults purely.*

* 2 Thes. 3. 10.

* *Mr.* Leigh *mistook the word it would not. But it comes to the same, for Infants have Power and will both alike.*

Ruf. What's all this? We do say, that Infants are not at all concerned in the Commission, *Mat.* 28.19. Because they cannot perform the prerequisites, Faith and Repentance, therefore are not capable of Baptism. Now if you'll say, that incapable Persons are intended in the Com-

Commiſſion, then I hope, you may put that upon your ſelves; Then you muſt argue, *Infants* muſt be ſtarved to Death becauſe they will not work. I demand of any of you to give an inſtance of any one Scripture, that ſpeaks of Baptiſm in the New Teſtament, that doth reſpect any other but adult Perſons. *

Will. If the eſſence of faith conſiſt in the Acts of the underſtanding and will, then *Infants* are incapable of being Diſciples. But, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

L. I deny the ſequel of the Major, *viz.* That *Infants* are uncapable of being Diſciples.

VVill. If a Diſciple and a Believer be the ſame thing, then the ſequel of the Major is true. But a Diſciple and *Believer* are the ſame thing. Therefore,

L. I diſtinguiſh upon the Minor. *It's* not Univerſally and in all reſpects the ſame thing. Thoſe may be Diſciples that are not actual Believers.

VVill. He that is a Diſciple of Chriſt according to the Commiſſion, is a Believer. But *Infants* are not capable of believing. Therefore. He that is a Believer in *Mark*, is a Diſciple in *Matthew*.

L. This I deny, and anſwered it before. It's not Univerſally true.

VVill. If the eſſence of faith conſiſt in the Act of the underſtanding and will, then *Infants* are uncapable of believing, *But, &c.*

L. I acknowledge, *The Act of faith conſiſts in the Act of the underſtanding and the will*, and that Infants are uncapable of actual believing, but not of being Diſciples in an impertect ſenſe*. *But I* would fain know if *Infants* are not as capable of believing Imputatively, as of coming to Chriſt when brought in the Arms of other Perſons. *

VVill. They can do both alike, as well come to Chriſt as believe in him; by believing I mean actual believing. This I acknowledge.

* *Reader, obſerve the Argument from* Luk. 14. *Is it opt. And what Mr.* Ruſ. *here ſays farther, had been Anſwered before in the Words,* All Nations, uſq; ad Nauſeam.

* *The contrary whereof, hath not yet been proved.*

* *Mat.* 19. 14.

L. Why cannot Children be said in a Spiritual sense to come to Christ Imputatively, as well as to come to Christ Corporally when only brought in others Arms. Coming to Christ and believing are the same. Tho' he that is brought in the Arms of the Parents faith cannot be said actually to believe, *yet Imputatively he may.*

Wil. How could they come to Christ when they were brought?

L. And yet they are expressly said to come to Christ. And may they not as well be said to be capable of Spiritual as of Corporal coming when they were brought to him? Why can they not come Spiritually *by Imputation, as before*?

Wil. They cannot come Spiritually unless they actually believe. A child cannot thus come to Christ without a sight of Christ and also of himself.

L. I do own in a proper and strict sense, none can be said thus to come to Christ but adult persons; yet in a more large sense, they may as well be said to believe on Christ Imputatively when their Parents believe and devote them to Christ, as to come to Christ Corporally when brought in their Arms. You know Christ says, suffer little Children to come to me. It's most probable these were brought in Arms to Christ. Why may they not be said Imputatively to believe, as well as Imputatively to come?

Wil. I deny that the parent's faith was ever imputed to the Child.

L. You know the distinction of Believers, *In foro Dei, & In foro Ecclesiæ*, which I suppose you'll allow. And under the notion of believers *In foro Ecclesiæ*, The Parents faith may be imputed to their Children.

Wil. We do say that a Person is not a Disciple of Christ before he have learned Christ *.

* *Here is no notice taken of the Distinction, only the old thing asserted.*

L. Then do we send Children to School because they have learned, or that they may learn?

Ruf. I think we should now see whether we can possibly by force of Argument bring you to give an Instance. Therefore I argue thus.

Arg.

Arg. 5. If the Apoſtles of our Lord never did Baptize any Infants, then the Baptiſm of Infants is not according to the Commiſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. But the Apoſtles of our Lord never did, &c: Therefore.

Chand. I deny the *Minor*.

Ruſ. If the Apoſtles did Baptize any Infants, it is ſome where to be found in the writings of the new Teſtament. But it's no where to be found, *&c.*

L. I deny your *Major*.

Ruſ. If there be no other rule to direct us concerning Holy Baptiſm than what is in the new Teſtament, then, becauſe it's no where to be found in the writings of the new Teſtament, the Apoſtles did never Baptize any Infants. But there is no other rule *&c*: Therefore *&c.*

L. You are come from an Example to a Rule. I ſay it may not be recorded in the writings of the New Teſtament, and yet the Apoſtles might Baptize Infants. But this is not granted, only ſuppoſed, *that it's not recorded.* It is not recorded in the New Teſtament (what you practiſe) that Grown Children of Believers were, when adult, Baptized. I challenge you to produce one inſtance of any, born of Believing Parents, baptized at Age.

Ruſ. That's no buſineſs of ours. Don't think to ſham off the buſineſs ſo. We have called for your Inſtance ſeveral times of an Infant Baptized, and you have not been able to give it.

L. It's the cuſtom of theſe Perſons to Baptize Grown Perſons tho' Baptized before, and yet there is no Scripture for it. They talk much of our having no Scripture for Infant Baptiſm, and of their having Abundance for their Practice. Now let them give one Inſtance of what is their Practice, *viz*: Of one Perſon born of a believer Baptized at years, and I'll give them the cauſe.

Wil. Give your inſtance for Infant Baptiſm, or elſe I hope the People will go away, and conclude you have none.

L. Give your inſtance to prove your Practice, or elſe I hope, the People will go away ſatisfy'd you have none to give. It was by the Computation of the learned from the Death of Chriſt to the Death of St. *John* the Apoſtle near Sixty Years, in which time many *Thouſands* of the Children

dren of Believing Parents became adult, yet we challenge you to produce one Inſtance in all that time of any of their Children Baptiz'd, when adult.

Ruſ. The Emperour Conſtantine was born of a Chriſtian Parent, and yet not baptized till adult.

L. But not becauſe they then thought the Children of Believing Parents had no right to Baptiſm, but becauſe they thought that ſins committed after Baptiſm were unpardonable; therefore, they oftentimes defer'd it till Death. * *Beſides*, this is not to the purpoſe, becauſe a Scripture inſtance was call'd for.

* *Beſides*, Conſtantine's *father was a* Pagan, *and* Conſtantine *had a deſire to be Baptiz'd in* Jordan, *becauſe Chriſt was.*

Will. We are able to produce ſeveral inſtances where grown believers were *B*aptized, but you not one of Infant *B*aptiſm.

L. That was at the firſt planting of the Goſpel: Give an inſtance of a grown perſon, deſcending from believing Parents, that was baptized when adult.

Ruſ. If this were any thing to the purpoſe, I would then ſay ſomething to it. But I wonder you ſhould talk thus, when it was practiſed a great many years in the Church to give the Lord's Supper to Infants *.

* *The Dr. allow'd it to be the firſt 600 years, as I remember.*

L. Was it? Then (*ad hominem*) they were Baptized, becauſe they were not to receive that *Ordinance* before they were baptized. We demand an inſtance of any child of a believing Parent that was baptized when adult. *Give this, and we will give you the Cauſe.*

Wil. Was the Mother of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt a believer? L. Yes.

Wil. Well then, there's the Son of a believer baptized at age *. Here the *Anabaptiſts* fell a laughing, and ſome cry'd out, *it's done, it's done.* And, for a while, Mr. *Leigh* attempting ſeveral times to ſpeak, could not be heard.

* *Obſerve, by Believers was before underſtood a Chriſtian Believer, by themſelves, wherever they ſpoke of believing as neceſſary to Baptiſm: Neither was the word taken in any other ſenſe. Beſides, it was granted before, that Jews and Pagans ought not to be baptiz'd till adult; and both Chriſt and his Mother were Jews at the time of his birth.*

L.

L. I thought our discourse had been grounded on the Commission. Was this before or after the Commission? *Here the people laugh'd again.*

Ruf. What do they laugh at? Not at what the Old Gentleman said, but at what Mr. *Leigh* says *. The Old Gentleman gave a right instance.

* *Indeed the people laughed both ways.*

Rob. It's not at all to the purpose.

Ruf. Mr. *Williams*'s instance was sufficiently to the purpose; for that Mr. *Leigh* called for an instance of the child of a believing Parent, baptized at grown years. The Virgin *Mary* was a Believer.

Rob. Tho Mr. *Leigh* did express himself in such general Terms, yet the whole strain of the discourse sufficiently manifests, he meant the child of such a believer as was properly Christian. The Virgin *Mary* was undoubtedly a believing Member of the Jewish Church; but this is not to our purpose; for we want an instance of the child of a Christian Parent, after Baptism was instituted by our Lord, that yet was baptized at grown years. The instance of our Saviour doth not agree to such a case as this is. For that Christianity, as distinguished from *Judaism*, had not then a being, and the Virgin *Mary* was not in this sense Christian, nor was baptism it self then instituted by our Lord; and therefore this instance can signify nothing to the case in hand.

Will. I have given an instance of the Child of a believing Parent, baptized at Age. Give us an instance of any Infant that was baptized.

L. As for that. Our Lord Jesus Christ is not to be imitated in that particular.

Ruf. No?

Will. Do you prove he was not.

L. If he were, then there is no Person to be baptized till 30 years of Age, nor baptized at all, unless Circumcised at eight days old. *And thus their Scripture instance, with their triumph upon it, vanished.*

Will. I demand an instance of an Infant that was baptiz'd.

L. I demand an express prohibition.

Will.

Will. I demand an expreſs prohibition of Salt, Cream, Oyl and Spittle.

L. I Anſwer, (1.) The caſe is not parallel. You ſpeak of the ſubſtance, we of the ſubjects of baptiſm. (2.) *Infants are included in the words*, All Nations. *But Salt, Cream, Oyl*, &c. *are not in the word* Diſciple, *or* Baptize.

Rob. What need of an inſtance when we have a rule. Now, Mr. *Chandler*, if you pleaſe, you may take the Part of an Opponent. And prove our practice to be agreeable to Scripture.

Mr. *Chandler* turns Opponent.

Arg. 1. *Chand.* Viſible Church Members ought to be baptized. But ſome Infants are viſible Church Members. Therefore ſome Infants, *&c.*

Ruſ. Adult believers may, but not Infants.

Rob. What's this to the purpoſe we are upon? Which of Mr. *Chandlers* propoſitions do you deny?

Ruſ. Let him repeat his Argument.

Chand. Viſible Church Members ought to be baptized, according to Chriſt's Commiſſion. But ſome Infants are viſible Church Members; Therefore, *&c.*

* *Mark that. The Dr. denies that viſible Church Members ought to be baptized.*

Ruſ. I deny the Major. *

Chand. That all viſible Church Members are to be baptized, according to Chriſts Commiſſion, I prove thus. If there be no Precept or Example in all the Word of God, ſince Chriſt ordain'd baptiſm, that makes any other ordinance the viſible means of entring a Perſon into the viſible Church, then viſible Church Members ought to be baptized, But there is no, *&c.* Therefore.

Ruſ. This is to ſay. Becauſe they are Members, therefore they are to be made Members.

Chand. No. Becauſe they are Members, they ought to be ſolemnly Recogniz'd as Members: Like the Coronation of a King. He is a King before he is Crown'd, but he is Crown'd that he might be own'd as King.

Will. If baptiſm be the initiating ordinance into the Church, then they were not Church Members before.

Chand.

Chand. I say, baptism is the solemn investing sign.

Ruf. That baptism is an initiating ordinance, I grant.

Rob. This Argument was brought to prove that visible ChurchMembers ought to be baptiz'd.

Will. I deny that Infants are visible Church Members in their Infancy. *

L. I'll prove that some Infants, are Church-Members in their Infancy; *Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 19. 14. Hence I argue: Those that belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, *i. e.* the Church-Militant here upon Earth, are visible Church-Members. But some Infants belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, *i, e. The Church-Militant here on Earth.* Therefore,

* *The Major is dropt, and he denies the Minor; after a while, you will find the Major silently taken up again.*

Will. I deny the *Minor*. That text proves it not.

L. If the Kingdom of Heaven cannot be taken any otherwise in this Text to make good sense of the Text, then it must be so taken, *i. e. For the Church-Militant here on Earth.* But it cannot be taken any otherwise to make good sense of the Text. Therefore *&c*: And this I prove by an Induction of particulars. There are various acceptations of this Expression, [*The Kingdom of Heaven*] in the Word of God. Sometimes it signifys, The Laws and Promises of the Kingdom; it doth also signify the Graces by which we observe those Laws and believe those Promises. Thus it's represented by a grain of Mustard-seed. Sometimes the Kingdom of Glory. And sometimes it signifies the Church-Militant. Hence therefore I thus argue.

If in this place it can neither signify the Laws and Promises of Gods Kingdom, nor the Graces by which we observe those Laws and Embrace those Promises, nor the Kingdom of Glory; then it must signify the Church-Militant here upon Earth. But it cannot signify either of the former. Therefore it must signify the last, *viz.* the Church-Militant.

Will. I deny the *Minor*. I say it signifys the Kingdom of Glory.

L. If it be nonſenſe ſo to underſtand the words then they are not ſo to be underſtood. But its nonſenſe, *&c*: For then the Kingdom of Glory muſt conſiſt *in part* of poor little weak things, ſuch as Infants are: Whereas after Death all are perfect in the Kingdom of Glory, whatever they are here on Earth.

Will. I thought it had been, to ſuch belongs the Kingdom of Heaven.

Chand. Mat. 19. 14. In the *Greek* it is, τουτων, of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven.

L. That is; of ſuch it conſiſts in part. If we mention the Kingdom of *England* or *France*, and ſay, of ſuch is the Kingdom, *&c*. It's to be underſtood, In part it conſiſts of theſe.

Will. I deny that the Viſible Church in part conſiſts of theſe. If they are neither Members of the Univerſal Church, nor of a Particular Church, then the Church doth not in part conſiſt of theſe; But, *&c*: Therefore, *&c.* *

* *He Anſwers not my Argument by making good ſenſe of the Text any other way. But now break's rule and turns Opponent.*

L. I Anſwer. Now you relinguiſh my Medium. But farther, If they are Members of the Church at all, then they are Members of the Univerſal Church viſible. But they are Members of the Church. Therefore, *&c.*

Will. I deny the Minor, *i. e. That they are viſible Members of the Church.*

L. There are two ſorts of Members of the Univerſal Church. There are Members in *foro Eccleſiæ*, and Members in *foro Cæli*. *In which of theſe ſenſes do you deny they are Members of the Church?*

Will. If by the Church, you mean the viſible Church, I deny your Minor. *Here for about four or five lines, there is great confuſion in what our ſcribes have written. But this I take to be the ſenſe of it.*

L. If they are Members of the Church in any ſenſe then they are Members of a Particular or the Univerſal Church, and if of a Particular then of the Univerſal which includes it; and therefore they are Members of the viſible Church. But they are Members of the Church

Church in ſome ſenſe, and for Proof hereof I return to my Argument which you have not been able to Anſwer; *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*, i. e. The Church Militant.

Will. I diſtinguiſh, as to the *Kingdom of Heaven*: It's there meant of the Kingdom of Glory.

L. If of the Kingdom of Glory, then it's nonſence. But, by the way, the Kingdom of Glory either is put for the Happineſs or Subjects of the Kingdom of Glory. If the Happineſs, then the words muſt run thus. *Of ſuch little Children is the Happineſs of the Kingdom of Glory.* If the ſubjects, then thus. *Of ſuch little Children are the ſubjects of the Kingdom of Glory.* Now neither of theſe is ſenſe; *Therefore cannot be meant: but my firſt interpretation ſtands good ſtill.*

Will. I diſtinguiſh between a right Title and Poſſeſſion. *Here is a vacancy* — Three things. It's true, faith gives a right to baptiſm according to the Commiſſion, a profeſſion of that faith gives a right to the Adminiſtration of that ordinance, and it's the Commiſſion that authoriſeth the Adminiſtrators.

Ruſ. This Text you produce hath no Relation at all to the Commiſſion, nor is Baptiſm in the leaſt intended in the Text.

L. Mr. *Ruſſel*, I'll propoſe this queſtion to you. Whether, both what Chriſt ſaid and did, together with what the Apoſtles ſaid and did, be the beſt explication of Chriſts Commiſſion? And then, whether, I may not argue from Chriſts own Words, *For viſible Church Membership and ſo for baptiſm*?

Ruſ. I do allow that what Chriſt ſaid and did, and what the Apoſtles ſaid and did, is a very good interpretation of the Commiſſion of our Lord. And I do ſay, that only adult Perſons are intended in the Commiſſion; And that the Apoſtles never did baptize any other than adult believers. *

L. Then I hope, we may argue from Chriſts own Words. Did he ſpeak pertinently or impertinently? *If pertinently, how comes he to ſay, of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven, unleſs he meant the viſible*

* *Here he takes no notice of the ſecond part which is the main of my Queſtion.*

visible Church, which alone makes sense of the Text. But is this an Answer to my Question, *to say that Adult believers are only intended in the Commission?*

Ruf. Yes, if your question relate to water baptism.

L. If the Kingdom of Heaven in part consists of Infants, then Infants ought to be baptized. But, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

Rob. Pray Mr. *Russel*, which of Mr. *Leighs* propositions do you deny?

L. Give me an Answer *directly.*

Ruf. I demand an Exposition. What do you mean by the Kingdom of Heaven?*

* *Here the* Dr. *could not tell what to say, and therefore will have all over again.*

L. I mean the Church and Kingdom of God here on Earth.

Ruf. I deny your *Minor.*

L. I prove it from the forecited Scripture. If by the Kingdom of Heaven, *Mat.* 19. is signified the Church visible here on Earth; Then Infants do in part make up the Church. But *&c*: Therefore *&c.*

Ruf. I deny your *Minor.*

L. If we must make good sense of Scripture then it must so signify. But *&c.*

Ruf. I deny the Consequence of your *Major.*

L. If the Kingdom of Heaven cannot be taken in any other signification to make good sense of it in that place, then it must so be taken. But it cannot *&c*: Therefore.

Ruf. I deny your *Minor.*

L. If you can produce no other good Interpretation that can make good sense of that Scripture, Then *&c.*

Ruf. I deny the Consequence of your *Major.* It doth not follow because I cannot do it, that therefore it cannot be done.

L. Then I say if neither you, nor any other person can produce any other good Interpretation that can make good sense of that Scripture, Then *&c.*

Ruf. Is this a good way of arguing? If it be, then it was so in me as well as you.

Rob. Mr. *Leigh.* It was not fair, therefore not allowed them. You must not put the Proof upon the Respondent.

Leigh.

Leigh. I was not driving them to Proof, but going to prove *my Assertion* by an Induction of Particulars, *as I have already done* and that I shall do again.

If the Kingdom of Heaven here signifys neither the Laws nor Promises of the Kingdom, nor Graces by which these Laws and Promises are observed and embraced, nor Jesus Christ's Management of his Kingdom, nor the Glory of Heaven, nor the Subjects of Glory, then it must signify the Church-Militant here upon Earth. But it signifys neither of the former. Therefore the last. *

* *Reader, to repeat all this is Nauseous, but because the* Dr. *could do nothing else he would force us to it.*

Ruf. I deny the *Minor*.

L. I prove it by a Recapitulation of those Particulars. Of such little Children are the Laws and Promises of the Kingdom, of such are the Graces by which we observe and embrace them, of such is Christs Management of his Kingdom, of such is the Kingdom of Glory, of such is the Happiness or Subjects of Glory. *Now is there any good sense in all this.*

Ruf. Its meant of the Kingdom of Glory.

L. By the Kingdom of Glory you must mean either the Happiness or Subjects of the Kingdom. If it be taken for the Happiness of the Kingdom of Glory, then I ask whether little Children are the Happiness of Heaven? If for the Subjects; then I ask whether of such consists the Subjects of the Kingdom of Glory, when every one belonging to that Kingdom, *i.e. as distinct from the Church-Militant*, immediately upon his expiring is compleat, even an Infant 3 days old?

Ruf. This is very uncharitable, to exclude Infants from Heaven. I would rather incline to say, and I am sure the contrary to it *Mr. Leigh* can never prove, that all Infants belong to the Kingdom of Glory, than that none do.

L. Yes we know your Judgment of that matter well enough. But you wilfully misrepresent my sense. I do not say that none who dy Infants go to the Kingdom of Glory, but that none are Infants when they come there. But the Text says, Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. This therefore is what I assert, that it is absurd to say that

the

the Kingdom of Glory is, in any part of it, made up of weak imperfect things as little Infants are; And therefore that the Kingdom of Heaven, here ſpoken of, muſt mean the Church-Militant here on Earth which is in part made up of ſuch,

Here Mr. *Ruſſel* was ſilent for a conſiderable time. *

Rob. What Mr. *Ruſſel* have you no reply to make to all this; Pray, if you have any thing to ſay, let us hear it; Otherwiſe, be ſo kind as to tell the People, you can give no Anſwer, that we may go on to ſome what further.

* *And thus to no purpoſe but to ſpend time Mr.* Ruſſel *would have the ſame over again.*

Ruſ. My Anſwer is this. That whereas you have undertaken to prove that Infants are the Subjects of Baptiſm, according to Chriſts Commiſſion, you bring a Text for it that hath neither the word Baptiſm in it nor the Commiſſion of our Lord. *

L. Very well then. If we prove from any Text of Scripture the right of Infants to Baptiſm, it muſt not be allowed, unleſs we find it in the cloſe of the Evangeliſts, *where is what you call the Commiſſion; or unleſs the word Baptiſm be in it.*

* *This poor dry evaſion, you ſee, he hath before, and is beholden to his old Friend* Danvers *for.*

Rob. Mr. *Ruſſel.* They are not obliged to have the mention either of Baptiſm or the Commiſſion of our Lord in the concluſion of every *Syllogiſm.* They had it in the firſt. They then told you; That ſuch as were Members of the Church-Militant on Earth were to be Baptiz'd according to the Commiſſion of our Lord. And this was the caſe of ſome Infants. You denyed any Infants were Members of Chriſts Kingdom, or Church-Militant here on Earth, and to prove this they brought that Text. And I ſuppoſe the whole company was ſatisfy'd that it doth ſufficiently prove what it was produced for. And now you dare not deny the *Major*; if you do I doubt not but they are ready to prove it.

Will. If Church Members have been denyed Baptiſm, then Church-Membership is not the ground of Bap-

tiſm.

tiſm. But *&c.*

L. I deny the *Minor.*

VVil. If Church-Members came to *John* to be Baptized, and were denyed, then Church-Memberſhip is is not the Ground of Baptiſm. But *&c.*

* *Here he ſhifts the Reſpondency and turns Opponent, which we give way to, becauſe they could do nothing elſe.*

L. I deny the Minor.

VVil. I prove it, *Mat.* 3. When he ſaw the Multitude and many of the Phariſees and Sadduces come to his baptiſm, he ſaid to them; *O Generation of Vipers*, &c.

L. I deny that they were *de jure*, Church Members whatever they were, *de facto.* Their being a Generation of Vipers is ſufficient to prove, they were not Church Members, *De jure*; *And we are ſpeaking of rightful Church Members.*

VVil. I have proved that Church Members were denied baptiſm.

L. I deny it and diſtinguiſh between Church Members, *De jure & De facto.*

Will. I will not meddle with your diſtirctions.

Rob. And can you think that the word *Church-Members* cannot poſſibly admit of more ſenſes than one?

L. I ſay, they were not Church Members, *De jure.*

VVil. Were they denied any priviledges?

Rob. According to what you ſaid juſt now, they were deny'd baptiſm, was that no Church priviledge?*

* *Here he drops his Argument, to prove that Church Membership is not the ground of baptiſm.*

VVil. Such as are viſible Members of the Univerſal Church, are qualify'd with a work of Grace, *&c.*

L. I deny it, *viz. That they are always ſo.*

VVil. It is in the Judgment of Charity ſo.

L. Such as were a Generation of Vipers were not qualify'd with a Work of Grace, and ſo were not Church Members, *according to your own aſſertion.*

Rob. Eſpecially ſuch as were known to be a Generation of Vipers.

VVil. If our Lord Jeſus did Diſciple ſuch as were Church Members before they were baptiz'd, then Church Memberſhip is not the ground of baptiſm. But, *&c.*

L.

L. We diſtinguiſh between the Jewiſh Church and the Chriſtian Church. *And then I diſtinguiſh between Infant Church Members; and Adult Church Members. Now Chriſtian Church Membership is a ground of baptiſm.*

Sharp. The Anabaptiſt Moderator. *You ſay Infants are Church Members; Church Members upon their apoſtacy ought to be Excommunicated: when were any admitted into Church Membership in their Infancy, Excommunicated upon their apoſtacy?*

Rob. *There is with us as with the* Jews *Anciently, a two fold Excommunication,* Excommunicatio Major, *and* Excommunicatio Minor: *as to the firſt, which is a ſolemn cutting off from the Univerſal Church, I queſtion, whether our Laws gives us the liberty of practiſing it; and as to the ſecond, which is a ſuſpenſion from the Lords Supper; I do not ſee that to be needful in the caſe before us.*

Leigh *to Mr.* Sharp; *we are not now talking about the management of Church Members, but who are the Perſons which ought to be eſteemed ſo? Farther, it is needleſs to exclude thoſe from Adult Church-Membership who never offered themſelves to it. It's as if we ſhould ſhut our doors againſt a Perſon, who never attempts an entrance.*

To this Mr. Sharp *made no reply.*

VVil. Miniſters are to Baptize none, but thoſe that are diſcipled by the words of the Commiſſion. *

* *Obſerve how he leaves his Argument, and runs to what had been worn threadbare before.*

Chand. Here's the Conſequence of it.

VVil. No here is no Genuine Conſequence. The Commiſſion mentions no more but Diſciples and Believers. And if you can find one Perſon more beſides Diſciples and Believers, *do it?* *

* *The poor Man runs again from conſequence to expreſs words, tho conſequence was allowed before.*

Ruſ. It doth appear by all that hath been ſaid, that our practice is allow'd.

Rob. Not your practice.

L. We do not allow your practice, unleſs to ſuch as have not been baptized.*

* *Remember, this refers to the Subjects only, not the manner.*

VVill. We agree, that thoſe that are not baptized ought to be baptized.

zed. You are bound to baptize none, but such as you are bound to Preach to.

L. I deny it.

Ruſ. Have Infants the uſe of reaſon?

Chand. No.*

Ruſ. If Infants, without underſtanding, are capable of being made Diſciples, by the Miniſtry of Men; Then may the Beaſts of the Field. But the Beaſts of the Field may not, *&c.* Therefore.

* *Now you ſee the Dr. very plainly takes the Opponency, becauſe he could do nothing elſe; contrary to his moſt falſe aſſertion in his Narrative.*

L. I appeal to all preſent. Is it as proper to take Pigs and Dogs to School, as little Children of a year and half old? *Are thoſe ſo capable of the Parent's reſignation and maſter's acceptation as theſe?* If Infants might keep the charge of the Sanctuary from a month old and upward, they may be eſteemed Believers and Diſciples. But, *&c.*

Ruſ. I wonder you will maintain ſtretching upon ſuch ſilly foundations.*

* *A wiſe Anſwer from a ſilly Doctor; is it not?*

L. Pray Anſwer the laſt Argument.

Ruſ. There is nothing of Chriſts Commiſſion in it.

L. Unleſs we can prove Infant baptiſm in the cloſe of one of the Evangeliſts; No proof is to be allowed.

Will. I thought it was to be argued according to the Commiſſion,* but I ſee, *&c.*

* *This was fully Anſwer'd before, therefore it was tedious for Scribes to write it.*

Rob. If you be of Mr. *Ruſſel's* mind, then you may turn your Children out to the Dogs and Pigs, and Beaſts of the Field. It is moſt inſufferable; I never heard ſuch an Expreſſion in my Life. But you may ſee what the Principles of *Anabaptiſts* naturally lead Men to.

Here the *Anabaptiſts* being ſhamefully nonpluſs't, Mr. *Leigh* apply'd himſelf to the Mayor and Governour, in this manner: You ſee they are not able to anſwer our firſt Argument, but are entirely gravell'd. The Rules of Diſputation oblige us to go no farther in the Opponency. Yet we will be at your command. We have ſix Arguments more at hand; if you pleaſe, we will proceed to

offer them: Or, if you pleaſe, we will proceed to the Second Queſtion.

Sharp. Anabaptiſt Moderator. Let us have a precept or an example.

Rob. A precedent we need not give, here is a precept brought and yet no Anſwer given to it.

Ruſ. What Precept?

Rob. That which by Undenyable Conſequence obliges us to it tho' there be not, in expreſs words, a requirement that we Baptize Infants.——One would have thought, Mr. *Ruſſel* ſhould have allowed, tho' they are not capable of Dutys, yet they are capable of the Priviledges.

Here an Anſwer to our laſt Argument was again and again call'd for, but none given.

Rob. Pray Mr. *Chandler*, let no more time be loſt, but proceed to another Argument.

Arg. 2. *Chand.* If ſome Infants be the Diſciples of Chriſt, then, according to the Commiſſion of our Lord, ſome Infants are to be Baptized. But ſome Infants are Diſciples. Therefore *&c.*

Ruſ. I deny your Minor.

Chand. Thoſe that the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture calls Diſciples, are Diſciples. But the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture calls ſome Infants Diſciples; Ergo they are Diſciples.

Ruſ. I deny your Minor.

Chand. I prove it from that Text. *Acts* 15. 10. Now therefore, why tempt you God, to put a yoke upon the necks of the Diſciples? Upon Infants the Yoke of Circumciſion was laid, They are call'd Diſciples.

Ruſ. I deny that Text proves it.

Chan. If this Yoke were laid upon the neck of the Diſciples, then Infants are Diſciples. But *&c*: Therefore *&c.*

Ruſ. I deny that there is any ſuch thing in the Text either expreſs'd or intended.

Chand. The diſpute was occaſion'd by ſome falſe Teachers, that had ſaid, except Chriſtians were Circumciſed, and kept the Law of *Moſes*, they could not be ſaved. Now ſays the Apoſtle, Why do you lay a Yoke upon the neck of the Diſciples *&c*: This Yoke was the Yoke of Circumciſion, which was laid on the neck of ſome Infants.

Ruſ.

Ruſs. No Infants can be here intended, for thoſe, who are called Diſciples in this verſe, are called Brethren and Believers in the *9th* verſe. And therefore it could not intend Infants.

L. We will read verſe the Firſt. Except ye be Circumciſed after the manner of *Moſes.* Now I ask you what was the manner of *Moſes*?

Ruſ. To cut the foreskin of their Fleſh.

L. Suppoſe we were to teach this People, as the Judaizing Chriſtians did them; Except you are Circumciſed after the manner of *Moſes* you can't be ſaved, no doubt but they would underſtand the manner of *Moſes* to intend, not only all the Circumſtances of it, but, that their Children muſt alſo be Circumciſed, this being after the manner of *Moſes.* Here I will form this Argument. If thoſe are called Diſciples who were to be Circumciſed after the manner of *Moſes*, Then Infants are Diſciples. But, *&c: And ſo ought to be Baptized.* Now they themſelves allow that Diſciples ought to be Baptized.

Ruſ. It's the Gentile Believers that are there called Diſciples.

Chand. It is all upon whom the Yoke of Circumciſion was laid, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear.

Will. They could bear the Yoke of Circumciſion.

Chand. They were not able to bear it. The Holy Ghoſt ſays ſo expreſly; which ſignifys the Painfullneſs and Troubleſomeneſs of that Ordinance.

L. What you ſay of moment is this. That Children are able to bear the Yoke of Circumciſion, therefore that Yoke is not there intended, but the whole Ceremonial Law. We allow the Ceremonial Law was included, but Circumciſion was here chiefly intended.

Will. If Circumciſion was binding to keep the whole Law, then this is not the Yoke that neither we nor our fathers were able to bear. But it was ſo, *Gal.* 5. 3.

L. Thus far I think the old Gentleman is in the right, that the Apoſtles are here and in the Epiſtle to the *Gal.* endeavouring the ſame thing, driving them off from the obſervation of the Ceremonial Law. But herein he is

mistaken, *He would leave out Circumcision, one of the prime and most painful parts of this Law, and so would leave out those Infants whom these Judaizing Christians advised to be Circumcised.*

Ruf. Prove that Infants are there intended.

L. If the context do oblige us to take in Infants, then they are there intended. But the context, *&c. Ergo.* It is a reproof of, or reasoning with, those that were inclined to impose Circumcision on the Necks of the Disciples, *and with it the whole Law of* Moses, *v.* 5. They were strictly observant of *Moses*'s Law, Nothing is more plain and obvious to one observant of *Moses*'s Law than to Circumcise Infants at eight days old. *And consequently nothing would they urge more on these Disciples.*

* *Here is a vacancy in the Notes of our Scribes.*

Ruf. If they be such as * *had their hearts purified by faith, brethren,* &c.

L. That's not necessary. Their being barely the Infants of these Disciples was enough. If I were to act the part of a Judaizing Christian, and were to perswade all these Gentlemen that they were to observe Circumcision according to the Law of *Moses*; And did call those Disciples, who were so Circumcised; Would they not take it to be sufficiently plain, that their Infants were intended as well as themselves. *And therefore, that I called their Infants Disciples.*

Ruf. If you bring a Text, and I shew you several weighty considerations, why it should not be understood in your sense: I expect not such Stories as these.

Rob. Is it not enough, if Mr. *Leigh* shews that this Text will admit of no other sense?

Will. If so be, that children were brought in, it would not follow that they were Disciples, for those that were Circumcised were not Disciples.

L. You say, the Qualification was, they must be believers and have their hearts purified by faith. *I Answer.* These Judaizing Christians would perswade them to Circumcise after the manner of *Moses*, *And so to take the Yoke not only themselves, but also on their Infants. Now all these,*

theſe, without diſtinction, on whom this Yoke was about to be laid are called Diſciples, and therefore their Infants.

Will. After the manner of Moſes; That relates to the Form, *not the Subjects. Here again is a vacancy in the Notes of our Scribes.*

Rob. Here hath been a great deal of time ſpent about this Argument. The Subſtance of what was ſaid on both ſides is this: Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Leigh* have urged, that ſuch as are Diſciples of Chriſt ought to be baptized, and that ſome Infants are Diſciples of Chriſt. This Mr. *Ruſſel* deny's; and they have proved it from this, That ſome Infants are call'd Diſciples by the Spirit of God. This alſo Mr. *Ruſſel* hath deny'd; So that the whole Queſtion reſults to this head: Whether any Infants be in Scripture call'd Diſciples? Now this hath been, I think, ſufficiently clear'd from this Text, *Act.* 15. 10. where the Perſons call'd Diſciples are thoſe, upon whom the Judaizing Chriſtians would have impoſed the Yoke of Circumciſion. The Doctrine, they taught the Chriſtian Gentiles, was, That their Chriſtianity would avail them nothing, It was to no purpoſe tho' they did Believe in Chriſt; unleſs they were alſo Circumciſed according to the Law of *Moſes*, they could not be ſaved. You all know what the Law of *Moſes* doth preſcribe and command in this caſe, not only, that they themſelves, but that every Male Child among them ſhould be Circumciſed.

Ruſ. It is not according to the Law of *Moſes*, but after the manner of *Moſes*.

Rob. Mr. *Ruſſel*, it's true; it's after the manner of *Moſes* in the Firſt verſe, but if you look forward into the Chapter, you will find expreſs mention of the Law of *Moſes*. You muſt be Circumciſed and keep the Law of *Moſes*. *v.* 5*th*. I ſuppoſe you that have ſo oft read this Chapter, could not but be ſenſible that ſuch an Expreſſion was there, tho' not in the firſt verſe; And therefore the diſtinction you will pretend to make between the Law of *Moſes* and the Manner of *Moſes*, was but a meer Evaſion, and in this caſe a Diſtinction without Difference. The one explains the other. That which is call'd their being Circumciſed after the manner of *Moſes*, in

in one place, is called their being Circumcised and Keeping the Law of *Moses* in the other place. They must be Circumcised as *Moses* did order, so that his Law might be observed and fulfilled in the doing of it; which it could not be, tho they themselves were Circumcised never so regularly, unless their Infants were so too. And yet the whole Body of those on whom the Pharisees would have imposed the Yoke of Circumcision, are here expressly call'd Disciples; This whole Body of Adult and Infants are therefore in common included under this Name, which was all that we had to prove. And we are now willing to refer it to the People, whether what hath been said be not sufficient Proof. If you please therefore, we will now proceed to the Second question. Pray Mr. *Chandler*, let the Company understand what it is.

Reader, Here observe. We were ready (as before mention'd) to offer several other Arguments, but no tollerable Answer being given to these two, neither the Rules of Disputation did oblige us, nor the Company's patience, and the approaching evening allow us to do it, unless the Second Question were wholly excluded.

Q. 2. Whether, according to the Commission of our Lord, Baptism be to be Administred by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming only, and not otherways.. It lies upon you to prove, that it is by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming only.

Ruf. The Holy Scripture shews the way of baptizing. But it doth not shew that sprinkling is the way. Therefore, *&c.* *

L. This Argument doth not prove, that it is by Dipping, *&c.* Only.

Rob. Conclude with the Words of the Question.

* *Here observe again, Dr.* Russel *would shift the Opponency on us.*

Ruf. I understand you own, it was in use in our Saviours time. *Here the Dr. spake several impertinencies, which our Scribes thought not worth the Writing.*

L. I deny all this.

Rob. Bring it into an Argument.

Ruf. I put it into a *Syllogism.* I say, If the Holy Scriptures do shew us the right way of Baptizing, according to

to Christ's appointment, and yet do not shew us that sprinkling is the way of Baptizing, then Sprinkling is not the right way of Baptizing. But &c: Therefore &c.

Rob. There is not one word of Sprinkling in the Question. It is, whether it be to be administred by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming, only.

Ruf. I argue thus then. If the Holy Scriptures—— He goes on as before.

Rob. Pray Mr. *Ruſſel.*

Ruf. What? Can't I begin to speak, but you must still be Interrupting me. I don't speak to you. I speak to Mr. *Chand.* If the Holy Scriptures shew us the right way of Baptizing and yet do not shew us that Sprinkling.——

Rob. If you would but observe order, you should have no Interruption from me. But you both must and shall conclude your Argument with the words of the Question, before Mr. *Respondent* shall take any notice of it.

Ruf. Must and shall Mr. Moderator?

Rob. Yes Mr. *Ruſſel* you both must and shall. Otherwise it were fitter you should call me Mr. *Cypher*, then Mr. *Moderator*, if in this case I cannot *Moderari.*

Ruf. If that Baptism which is appointed by Christ and doth properly set forth his Burial and Resurrection is the only right way of Baptizing, then it must be performed by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming only and not otherways. But that baptism, &c. Is the only right way, &c. Therefore, &c.

Chand. I first deny the Consequence of the Major. And then I deny the Minor.

Ruf. Then you do suppose, that it doth represent the Burial and Resurrection of Christ, yet it doth not thence follow, that this is the only right way of baptizing.

My Argument hath two parts which I shall prove. First, That it doth set forth the Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Secondly, That therefore it is the only right way of baptizing. First, It doth set forth the Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. Buried with Christ in baptism, wherein also you

you are risen with him through the faith of the Operation of God. And, I do say that, Buried with Christ in his Sepulchre we cannot possibly be, but the Apostle says, we are Buried with him in baptism, which doth properly represent the Burial and Resurrection of Christ. Now I proceed to the next, to shew that therefore it is the only right way. If there was no other baptism instituted by Christ, nor practised by the Apostles and first Ministers of the Gospel, but what doth represent the Burial and Resurrection of Christ; Then Dipping only is the right way of baptizing. But, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.*

Chand. This is not the Consequence of the Major. You are to prove that, because baptism is significant of the Burial and Resurrection of Christ; Therefore it must be by Dipping only.

Ruf. Therefore I argue thus. If this was the only way practised in those times, then it must be by dipping only. *

Chand. I deny the Minor.

Ruf. If there be any other way, then you or some other Person is able to shew it. But, *&c.*

Chand. I can shew you another way——I can shew that the word signifies *Washing*, and there is great Probability that many had water poured on them.

Ruf. Give an instance in the New Testament, that any was baptized any other way.

L. We argue upon a Probability, It might be *otherwise than by Dipping; there is no necessity of Dipping.* If you'll grant that, we will go upon somewhat else, *viz. That it must be in our climate according to our way. But if not; you must prove that there is no Probability, that it might be done any other way than by Dipping.*

Ruf. Let us hear *then what the Scripture says in this matter.*

L.

* *Reader. Observe, That the Dr. grounds his practice upon two Arguments link'd together, viz. The resemblance between Dipping and a Burial. And Primitive Practice. Mr.* Chandler, *denies this resemblance between Dipping and Burial, to conclude for Dipping. And he ought to have proved that it doth; but instead thereof, he insists upon his second Argument drawn from Primitive practice. Hereupon there was no room (without contention) to urge any thing more against their first Argument. But you have it sufficiently Answered in the brief Confutation.*

L. Prove that those Texts where you render [baptism] by dipping, do truly and *necessarily* signify Dipping. Take what Text you will.

Rus. I chuse that of our Saviour, *Mar.* 1. 9. He was baptized of *John* in *Jordan*. *The Greek preposition is*, εις, *Into. And to say, he was washed of* John *into* Jordan *is not sense; therefore it ought to be render'd thus, He was dipped of* John *into* Jordan.

L. The preposition, εις, signifies [*in*] in the New Testament, as well as *into*; so here, he was baptized of *John* in *Jordan*, *is the true sense of the* Greek.

Now we will allow thus far. That what was commodious and usually practised *on other occasions* without any burthen, in that warm Country, might be observed in baptism. It is said, that all *Judea* and the Country round came to *John* and were baptized of him in *Jordan*. In those hot Countreys the custom was to go bare leg'd, in sandals. Now they might go into *Jordan* a little way, and then have water pour'd upon them; and if so, allowing that the Word βαπτιζω signifies *to wash*, *They might be said in this manner to be washed in* Jordan, *without the least necessity of Dipping*. I will offer it to the Company whether this be not a fair interpretation of those words, *Mar.* 1. 9. Christ came to *John* and was baptized of him in *Jordan*, i. e. *He went a step into the water, and was washed of him, in the manner aforesaid.*

Rus. I will not allow your signification of the word. I say the word, εις signifies more than, *In*; So Christ is said to come into the world, εις των * κοσμον, 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. He went into the Synagogue, εις: And so into *Jordan*, εις των † Ιορδανην. This doth imply *that he was Baptized or dipt into* Jordan, *as those other Texts, that he came into the Synagogue*, &c.

* *Excellent* Greek.

† *Good* Greek *still.*

L. This Gentleman produceth three places where εις signifys into, and I can produce three times three, where it cannot signify into, but must signify * In. The force of your Argument lies upon εις which you would have render'd Into, where it

* *Here we were going to read, but they gave no room.*

signify's *In.* Then, *add this to what* I offer'd before, as a probable Interpretation contrary to yours, it's evident that there's no neceſſity of Dipping, *from this Text.*

Rob. There can be nothing beyond a probability aſſerted on our ſide or yours.

Chand. Well, prove that βαπτίζω ſignifys *abluo, To waſh* *waſh*
frequently in Scripture. Thither we will go, That's our tale.

Ruſ. According to all *Lexicographers* the primary ſignification of the word βαπτίζω is, *mergo, immergo,* to Plunge, Overwhelm.

L. But by the way, you prove your Practice from the Prime and Native Signification of the word. *Suppoſe it were mergo, to Plunge, and not abluo,* (*which yet we deny*) You cannot argue from the Native Signification of a word, *with any force, when the Scripture acceptation of it is different.*

Ruſ. I did urge the Commiſſion of our Saviour:

Chand. You are to prove that Dipping is the only way. If the word will bear the ſenſe of *waſhing or* pouring water, then dipping is not the only way.

L. You argue from the Prime and Native Signification of the word. I'll appeal *to the Learned. If this be a good way of arguing; Then the Mathematics muſt include all kind of Learning. Becauſe it come's from* Μαθάνω *to learn. Then every Youth that is skill'd but a little in Phyſicks, may be call'd a Phyſician, becauſe it comes from* φυσις. *Nay, and every Foot-boy, ſent with a Letter, may be called an Angel, becauſe* Ἄγγελος *ſignifies Meſſenger. To know therefore the ſenſe of the word* βαπτίζω *in this ordinance, we muſt conſider in what ſenſe the word is uſually taken in Scripture. And to ſay it ſignify's to Dip, where the ordinance is mention'd, is plainly to beg the Queſtion, to aſſert the thing without proof; Therefore, rightly to underſtand the ſenſe of the word, we muſt have recourſe to thoſe places where the word is uſed, and the ordinance not intended.* Now I require one ſuch place of Scripture where the word βαπτίζω ſignify's to dip *neceſſarily.*

Ruſ. *No there is no need of producing ſuch a place.* I ſhall prove it from the ſtory of the *Eunuch* and *Philip.* He commanded the Chariot to ſtand ſtill, and they both went

went down into the water, and then, when he had put him under water, they both came out of the water.

* *The Text* Ac. 8, 38. *hath not a word of putting him under the water.*

L. I deny that the word [Baptize] signifys to dip in any place of Scripture, *or to put under water.* i. e. *Necessarily.*

Ruf. Mat. 3. 6. They were Baptized, *i.e.* dip't of *John* in *Jordan.*

L. How doth it appear that they were dip'd?

Ruf. The *Assembly*, The Continuators of *Pool*, *Calvin*, Dr. *Hammond* allow it.

Chand. That's nothing to us. I defye you to prove that the word βαπτιζω in any Text of Scripture signify's to dip.

Ruf. What then? You deny what Dr. *Hammond*, the *Assembly*, the *Dutch* Annotations have said.

L. We cannot say they have said so. We have not their Books at hand to turn to. Besides, suppose they should, that's no Proof. *We are no Papists, to pin our faith on other Mens Sleeves.*

In the next place. Whereas Mr. *Russel* hath brought the passage of *Philip* and the *Eunuch*, That they went down into the water and came up out of the water. It might as well be render'd, They went to and came from the water *. Now if they came by a River's side, they might go down out of a Chariot when the *Eunuch* was Baptized, they came up from the water. Is not this a fair sense of these words? They went to and came from the water *. Again if you argue from the word βαπτιζω, I can tell you of Seven Places, where the word is used and not applyed to the ordinance, And you cannot prove that it signify's to dip in any of them. *I argue thus.* If there are several Texts of Scripture, where the word cannot possibly bear this sense; Then it doth not necessarily bear it. But &c.

* *So the* Greek *Prepositions often signify.*

* *Where is dipping to be found in this Text?*

Ruf. I deny the *Minor.*

L. I prove it by some Instances; *Mark.* 7. 4. Except

they wash, they eat not: τὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται except they be Baptized. But can it be imagined that they were plunged over head and ears every time they went to meals?

Ruf. The word is sometimes render'd *dipping* in our *English* Translation, as, He that dippeth with me in the dish.

L. The word is there βάπτω, not βαπτίζω; besides, this would avail your cause but little, for can you suppose that he dipt himself over head and ears in the dish?

A Gentleman in the Company. I'm sure he would be foul and sawcy then.

Ruf. But βάπτω, *is a Diminutive from* βαπτίζω.

A Gentleman said to his Neighbour. Because βάπτω *is a smaller word, he thinks it must be its Diminutive.* *

**This whole passage hath been attested by the Person that spake the words.*

L. I find the word to signify no more then νίπτω, *Mark.* 7. 4, 5. And so *Naaman* is said to observe the Prophets word, which was λέγω, yet he went, and, as we read, dipped. Now since he observed the command of the Prophet, it is plain that βάπτω doth not necessarily signify any thing but washing.

Ruf. What is the word in the *Hebrew*?

Chan. There are two words, רחץ and טבל: And the Prophet commanded him, רחץ; and it is added, according to the word of the Prophet, ויטבל, where it is plain the words are used promiscuously; and טבל signifies no more than רחץ. So also we may observe, Christ commanded the blind man to wash in the Pool of *Siloam.* Must it be said, that he was dipt there? or can it be proved that *Naaman* was dipt, because βάπτω? *Nay,* βαπτίζω *is so far from always signifying to dip, that* βάπτω *it self, tho generally used in this sense, yet sometimes signifies only to wet a little. Thus* Dan. 4. 33. Nebuchadnezzar *was wet with the Dew of Heaven. The Septuagint renders it* ἐβάφη.

Ruf. But the Hebrew *is not* טבל.

Chan. What is it then? Here is an Hebrew *Bible, if you'll see.*

Here

Here the *Hebrew* Bible was handed to him, of *Leusden's* 2d Edit. and Mr. *Russel* kept it turning from place to place above half a quarter of an hour, and could not find out the Book of *Daniel*, upon which the People fell a hissing. Then the *Hebrew* Bible was handed to Mr. *Robinson* who turned the leaf down at the place, and handed it back again to Mr. *Russel*, who stood with his Spectacles on his nose, a while longer, poring on it, but could not read it. But he said, he understood *Hebrew* before Mr. *Chandler* was born, * and to satisfy the Auditory that he did so, turn'd to the First Chapter of *Genesis*, where he read some part of a verse, or verses. And then again turned to *Daniel*, and could not read the words yet. After some time more, Mr. *Russel* pretended to read some words, but with a low Voice.

* *We have good Intelligence that the Dr. puzzl'd thus on the same Word, at a Publick Disputation sometime before.*

Chand. We come not here, Mr. *Russel*, to know whether you understand *Hebrew*, only tell us what the word is in this place. *Which he could not do.*

L. We can produce several other texts of Scripture, where βαπτίζω cannot signify Dipping, as where we read of their washing Beds or Tables, the word is Baptize according to the *Greek*.

Russ. I deny it.

Chand. There is κλι——

L. What wash Beds, or Tables, by Dipping them under Water? Or must it be by pouring Water on them &c.? Upon the whole, the Application of a little Water in Baptism, especially in these Cold Climates, is grounded upon what Christ quotes. I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice. Now it being not Necessarily implyed *in Scripture* that Dipping was the ancient Practice, we say, that having a fair and probable way deducible from Scripture, *we must rest therein*, having recourse to that general rule. *Davids* hunger was a fair excuse for eating the shew-bread, which is call'd Most Holy, *and Lawful only for the Priests to Eat*. Therefore, if Dipping in Cold Weather, and Cold Climates, do tend to the Prejudice of a Person's Health, *yea to Endanger Life, and it be not certainly fixt*

ſixt in Scripture, as the only way of Adminiſtring the Ordinance, we may uſe our own way, as, in General, moſt agreeable to the word of God.

Ruſ. They think, tho' they Transgreſs a Rule, God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice.

L. No. This is not ſo. *We obſerve the rule, a Moral Precept, which take's place of a Ritual, when oppoſite; Much more is it Obligatory when it's not evident that any Ritual one doth oppoſe it.*

Chand. If in thoſe hot Countrys they had dip't, or been obliged to dip, this would not hold in ſuch Climates, and at ſuch Seaſons of the Year wherein the Life of a Perſon would, this way, be Manifeſtly expoſed to Danger.

Mr. *Ruſſel* here attempted to read ſeveral Quotations, that he had Collected out of the Aſſemblies *Anpot.* Pool, Dr. *Ham. &c.* which had been before diſowned. And therefore the People refuſed to hear him, as being nothing to the purpoſe, however he ſpake to this effect.

Ruſ. I hope the People will obſerve, that you are forc'd to differ from the *Revd.* Aſſembly of Divines, *&c.*

Chand. The Bible, the Bible is our Religion.

Rob. Mr. *Ruſſel*, we are not aſhamed to own our ſelves Proteſtants, with whom it is a Fundamental Principle, that the greateſt and beſt of Men are fallible; And therefore our Aſſent is not concluded by the meer words of one or other name how great ſoever. We pay a juſt deference to the very worthy names you mention'd, but we cannot think our ſelves obliged to believe every thing they ſay. If you have any Solid Reaſons to offer, or the clear evidence of any Text of Scripture, to determine this point, pray let us hear it before we cloſe up the day. Nothing being ſaid, he, applying himſelf to the People, added.

Rob. A great deal of looſe diſcourſe you have heard, upon this laſt Queſtion. Mr. *Ruſſel* was obliged by all the Laws of Diſputation, to prove, that according to the Commiſſion of our Lord, Baptiſm was to be adminiſtred by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming, and no otherwiſe. Some attempts he made towards it, o' the weakneſs of

which,

which, I doubt not but, you are all ſenſible; And therefore (which yet they were not obliged to) Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Leigh* undertook to prove that it was not Neceſſarily to be ſo Adminiſtred. For the clearing of which, they have manifeſted that the word βαπτίζω in the *Greek* as well as טבל in the *Hebrew* doth not, neceſſarily, ſignify any thing more than only to Waſh, or, to apply water to a Perſon, without determining whether it ſhall be by dipping a Perſon into water, or pouring water upon him, or any other way; ſo that water be applyed, is is all that can neceſſarily be concluded from the words. Of this they have given clear evidence both from the Old Teſtament and the New.

And now upon the whole, we are willing to refer it to your own Judgments, whether you will be perſwaded to account your own Baptiſm a Nullity, becauſe it hath not been adminiſtred in the way of theſe Perſons. If you can without any Solid Reaſon, or without ſo much as the evidence of one ſingle Text of Scripture, be Satisfyed, you may then take what our adverſaries have ſaid for Satisfaction. But, ſince it hath been fully proved, that Chriſt hath only required that Perſons be Solemnly entred into his Church by Baptizing or Waſhing them in the Name of Father, Son and Spirit, and hath not determined, ſo far as doth appear, whether this waſhing ſhall be performed this way or that, we are willing, I ſay, to refer it to the Judgment of you all, whether our way of Adminiſtration be not the moſt commodious:

FINIS.

I have compar'd this Copy with the Original, viz. *Mr.* Maltby's *and my own, and find it exactly agreeable thereto.*

Witneſs, my Hand, this 10th day of *July*, 1699. W. SMITH.

Some Just Reflections on Dr. Ruffel's *pretended Narrative.*

THIS with great Regret, that we are again diverted from more pleasing and useful Studies, to dip our Pens in this Watry Controversy, and undertake this Invidious Service. As we were Necessitated by the Anabaptists Challenge to the Disputation it self, so had they not (by Publishing a false account,) laid us under a like Necessity to Vindicate the Truth and our selves, the World had never more heard of this matter. In these our Reflections, we shall Manifest the Author's Egregious Falshood, in some parts of his Narrative, his Trifling Impertinencys in others, and the Uncharitable Principles that have drop'd from him.

The Narrative is pretended to be Transcrib'd from Mr. *Bissel*'s and Mr. *Ring*'s Copy's. Now we can assure the World, that Mr. *Bissel*'s Copy was like a Lawyer's Breviate, containing only hints for Memory, and may be all contain'd in 3 or 4 pages, and hardly one word of it in this Narrative. As to Mr. *Ring*'s, we have taken the pains to compare it with this account, and find several hundred Falshoods, Additions, Alterations and Omissions. It is an ill omen thus to stumble at the Threshold; and what begins with a Falshood, we have Reason enough to Mistruft. But to the Narrative it self, we shall (as to some parts) shew it's Egregious Falshood as to matters of fact, and that by its Omissions of some, and misciting other particulars, as well as positive false assertions.

1. It is Egregiously false by Reason of its Omissions. Not that every Omission of a word or Sentence, (perhaps) would have render'd it so; but such Omissions as alter the very State of the Disputation, and make it look like another thing, than it truly was, are undoubtedly to be call'd Falshoods. Should any one pretend-

ing

ing to report the Pſalmiſts Senſe, *Pſ.* 14. 1. leave out the firſt words, and aſſure the world he ſaid, *there is no God*; would not this be call'd a Notorious Falſhood? tho the Falſeneſs of it lies, in not relating the whole Sentence. From whence it may be collected, That it is not only aſſerting what was never ſaid, but alſo the Omiſſion of ſomething that was ſaid, may bring an Hiſtorian under the Guilt of Falſifying. And whether it be not ſo in the preſent caſe, we ſhall leave the World to judge, in theſe few Inſtances.

Mr. *Leigh*, upon their frequent preſſing for an Inſtance from Scripture, of our Practice in Baptizing Infants, happily retorted the Argument upon themſelves, and challeng'd them to produce one Inſtance of their Practice, as theirs differs from ours. For all that know us, know we alſo baptize ſuch as are adult, upon the Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, that were not baptiz'd in Infancy: Nay, that we ſhould refuſe to baptize the Child of an Heathen, or other Notorious Infidel, (unleſs adopted by ſome Chriſtian) till he become adult, and make a credible Profeſſion of Chriſtianity. Mr. *Leigh* therefore preſs'd them for one Scripture-Inſtance of a believing, meaning a Chriſtian Parents Child, whoſe Baptiſm was delay'd till adult. And withal, told them, That from the Death of Chriſt to the Death of St. *John*, according to the computation of the Learned, was about 60 years, in which compaſs of Time, multitudes of Chriſtians Children were become adult. Dr. *Ruſſel* mention'd *Conſtantine* the Great as a Scripture-Inſtance, which was juſtly ridicul'd: Mr. *Williams*, as he acknowledg'd to us afterwards, thought it not of any Force, and by the intimation of his Son, alledges the Inſtance of our Lord, as born of a Believer, of the Virgin *Mary*. To which Mr. *Leigh* reply'd, *I thought we had been ſpeaking of the Commiſſion; now this was before the Commiſſion.* Intimating, that the Inſtance was not pertinent, relating to a Baptiſm that preceeded the Commiſſion of our Lord; and therefore our Diſputation was no way concern'd in it. Notwithſtanding this, Dr. *Ruſſel* would have it a pertinent Anſwer, Chriſt being the Child of a Believer. And to this he reports no Anſwer, but makes Mr. *Leigh* ſeek to be Opponent upon it, as if confounded with this Inſtance, *pag.* 35. Whereas, immediately upon the Reply of Dr. *Ruſſel*, Mr. *Robinſon*, our Moderator, adds, *Tho Mr.* Leigh *expreſs'd himſelf in ſo general Terms, yet the whole ſtrain of the Diſcourſe did ſufficiently manifeſt that an Inſtance of the Child of a Believer, properly Chriſtian, was call'd for: Now the Virgin* Mary *was a Jew, and not then a Chriſtian: Nor was Chriſtian Baptiſm then inſtituted.* With more to the ſame purpoſe. Mr. *Leigh* alſo further reply-ed, *That Chriſt was not to be imitated in that, becauſe then no Perſon:*

ought to be baptized till 30; *nor except circumcis'd at* 8 *days old*, as the Reader may see in the foregoing Narrative. After which Dr. *Russel* offer'd nothing. Now we appeal to all the World, whether when so large and distinct a Reply was made, both by Mr. *Robinson* and Mr. *Leigh*, this man hath fairly represented our Cause, when he takes no notice at all of it. But if this Gentleman, or any of his Friends, can yet produce one Scripture-Instance of the Child of a Christian Parent, baptiz'd at grown years, it will be somewhat to the purpose; and they may have the confidence to call for Instances from us, and to pretend that theirs (as distinguish'd from ours) is the Scripture-way, and most agreeable to the Commission of our Lord: But till then how unreasonable is it for them to expect Instances of our way, when they have none to produce for their own?

Again he hath omitted to tell the World, (what all that were present well Remember,) that he was put to Silence by what was urg'd from *Mat.* 19. 14. to prove Infant Members of the Church-Militant upon Earth. Insomuch that after a long Silence, Mr. *Robinson* call'd to him, and ask'd if he had no reply to make, and beg'd of him that if he had any thing to say he would speak; otherwise tell the People that we might proceed. To which Dr. *Russel* made a very weak reply. that in this Text there is not a word of Baptism, or the Commission; and Mr. *W.* instead of Answering took the Opponency, as in the Narrative. But not one word more from that Argument could be got from Dr *Russel*.

Besides tho' he hath conceal'd yet he cannot (himself) have forgotten, that the 2*d*. Argument on our part, where he was again Silenced, was sum'd up by Mr. *Robinson* in the words of our Narrative: Then we refer'd it to the Gentlemen present, whether we should offer any more Arguments on the 1*st* Question, and it was thought wholly needless. Mr. *Robinsons* closing Speech on the 2*d*. Question, is also wholly omitted.

We forbear to mention here, how he hath omitted such passages as did sufficiently expose his Ignorance to the Learned part of the company: Such as were his telling us once and again, that μαθητεύσατε was of the Masculine Gender, agreeing with αὐτὸς when *Greek* Verbs admit not of Genders, tho' *Hebrew* do; and his saying εἰς τῶν Ἰουδαίων as if it had been with an *Omega* and *I Consonant*. So εἰς τοῦς κοσμους. Faults for which a School Boy would deserve the lash.

And when he was not allow'd to conclude his first Argument, on the 2*d*. Question, otherwise than with the words of the Question, it will be Remember'd (tho' his Narrative hath not told us,) with how great difficulty he form'd his *Syllogism*, and

and how many attempts he made before he could bring the words of the Queſtion, into the concluſion: Inſomuch that our Moderator offer'd him his Aſſiſtance.

Theſe and ſeveral other particulars which quite alter the Face of the Diſputation, were by no means to be omitted: Neither can that be call'd a True Narrative, that ſuppreſſeth the Truth in ſuch Inſtances as theſe.

2. This Narrative is falſe, in regard of its ſtrange miſplacing ſome Particulars: on which account the Reader can form no true Idea of the Diſputation. So, for inſtance, what he ſays concerning ΔΟΥΣ and ΜΑΘΗΤΕΥΣΑΤΕ page 34. (tho' all it is true) ſhould have come in in the midſt of Mr *William*'s rambling Diſcourſe, betwixt Dr. *Ruſſel*'s 4th and 5th Arguments: and that about the *Beaſts of the Field*, ſhould have had its place betwixt the 1ſt and 2d Argument on our part for *Infant Baptiſm*: when Mr. *Williams* and *Ruſſel* were both Rambling again. And had they been found in their proper places, as in Mr. *Rine*'s Copy, which *Narrative Ruſſel* pretends to tranſcribe, they would only have ſerv'd to expoſe the Weakneſs of him that brought them. But as he hath plac'd them here, they ſerve to hide the ſhameful Baffle they and their Cauſe had by the Arguments on our ſide. For, as was ſaid before, they never re-aſſum'd the Opponency on the firſt Queſtion, after the cloſing up the Argument from Infants Diſcipleſhip. Tho Dr. *Ruſſel* brings in theſe Two Arguments, as if they went off with Triumph, to the 2d Queſtion. Which yet every Judicious Auditor Knows to be Falſe. Leſſer ſlips we paſs by.

3. He hath forg'd ſeveral downright Falſhoods; one of which is juſt under our Eye, with relation to what is immdiately before ſaid, and therefore (tho a little out of its place) ſhall mention it here. He poſitively tells the World, that Mr. *Leigh* ſaid, *they might take up the Opponency again, if they pleas'd*: And again, *that he re-aſſum'd the Opponency again, at Mr. Leigh's Requeſt, of which he was ſick.* With much of the ſame ſort, page 34. Which is the meer Figment of his own Brain, and not one Syllable of it True. The Omiſſion of ſome things that were ſaid, tho' it alter the Face of the Diſputation, might be Imputed to a weak Imperfect Copy: But this muſt needs be a Contriv'd and Deliberate Falſhood; nor hath he a right to be Believ'd in any thing, that dare Forge and Publiſh ſuch an untruth.

But becauſe the Preface is almoſt one continued Falſhood, we ſhall particularly take notice of it.

1. He declares Mr. *Bows* and Mr. *Webber* were the ſole cauſe of his being Engag'd in the Diſputation, whereas Mr. *Webber* hath declar'd to Mr. *Smith* and Mr. *Chandler*, that he utter-

ly disliked the dispute from the Beginning, and was only thus far concern'd; seeing they would Engage he advis'd rather to Dr. *Russel* than *Mathew Caffin*, whom Mr. *Bows* had pitch'd upon. A Man that denys both the Deity and Humanity of Christ, against whom Dr. *Russel* hath Printed an Honest Protestation. And this Man tho' overturning the Fundamentals of Christianity is hugg'd by Mr. *Bows*: Because he agrees with him, in the darling Notions of Believers Baptism by dipping; Which, he told the Worshipful the *Mayor* of *Portsmouth*, was a Fundamental of Religion. Thus uncharitably doth this Man shut us all out of Heaven, and confine Religion to his own party, while a denyer of Christs Deity and Humanity hath been since, as well as before the Disputation, admitted into his Pulpit, while he, as a Messenger of the Churches, was travelling busily to spread false Reports against us.

2. Another falshood which is indeed from the wrong Information of Mr. *Leddell*, (that Man of heat, which much Water cannot Quench,) is this; that he should twice go to Mr. *Smith* to compare Copys and he refus'd to do so, altho' his Copy was then finish'd. This is a downright falshood as appears by the annexed Testimonial.

To convince the World of the falseness of what is said in the 2 Page of the first leaf of Dr. Russel's *Dedication, with Respect to my self; I do declare, that Mr. William* Leddell *never came to me but once, when he ask'd me whether I had Transcrib'd what I wrote at the Disputation; I told him I had not, but intended to do it. He farther said if I had, when I had done it, he desired to have it to read over; and I should have Mr. Samuel* Rings *Copy which was Transcribed; to which I Answered, that I had but an Imperfect Account of the Matter, which I Believe is the most that any Scribe who wrote at the dispute, could truly say of what they wrote, it being so full of confusion occasioned thro' the Anabaptists loose and shuffling way of Arguing. Mr. Leddel never intimated to me any design they had to Print the Disputation, nor did I think they really intended any such thing, because not long before, In my own and several other Persons hearing, Mr.* Leddel *did protest against Printing it. I had not when he came to me Transcribed one word from my Copy, neither was it finished till about 14 Days since; had I known their design of Printing I would have gotten my Copy ready for them: Which might have prevented Dr.* Russel *from Publishing so many untruths to the World. Witness my hand the* 10 *day of* July, 1699.

William Smith.

The Truth of the above Relation, I do atteſt; being preſent when Mr Leddell *came to Mr.* Smith, *and knowing what is ſaid about the time of Tranſcribing his Coppy to be True. Witneſs my hand the Day and year above ſaid.*

William Wallen.

3. It is falſe that Mr. *Chandlers* Sermons were the occaſion of the Diſpute, and much more, that this is agreed to by us. As he aſſerts pr. pag. 2. We are all of Opinion, Mr. *Bow's* Impudent challeng was the occaſion of it, tho' Mr. *Chandlers* Sermons were the Innocent occaſion of that challenge. So that according to the Proverb, he might as well have ſaid Tenterden Steeple was the cauſe of *Goodwin* Sands.

4. It is falſe that it lay upon us to prove our Practice, when in the Preliminarys they that made the challenge undertook to be Aſſerters, and Dr. *Ruſſel* took the Opponency upon himſelf: He hath alſo abus'd Dr. *Smith*, who told him as he was Aſſertor he muſt prove, but *Negantis non eſt probare.*

5. It is falſe that as he ſays pr. pag. 8. Mr. *Robinſon* ſhould in the midſt of the diſpute give him the lye, and yet could not make any thing out about it. This ſentence contains as many Falſhoods as can poſſibly be crowded into ſo narrow a compaſs. That Mr. *Robinſon* ſpeaks with a loud voice, is what all that know him, know to be falſe. Yet this Gentleman ventures to ſay pag. 13. he bawl'd very loud; again pag. 35. Mr *Robinſon* ſtood up, made a noiſe like one in a Delirious Paroxyſm. What doth the Man mean to Write at ſuch a rate as this? Surely he thinks loud lies will do no hurt.

And that Mr. *Robinſon* ever did in the Diſputation give him the lye, (as far as can by himſelf or Freinds be Recollected, or be made appear by any Copys then taken) is wholly untrue; and 'tis ſtrange (if this Dignify'd *Dr.* So well Remember it) that he could find no place for it in his Narrative; that ſo the Circumſtances that attended it, might have aſſiſted our Memories.

Yet (that we may not wrong him,) Mr. *Leigh* owns the words as his: That without a Complement it was a lie in him, to inſinuate to the People, as if Mr. *Leigh* would have all Infants excluded from Heaven.

Beſides he intimates, upon giving him the lie, there was a challenge made to the party to prove it, and yet he could make nothing out about it. Whereas there was never any ſuch challenge given, and we are ready to prove to his Face, that in the Diſputation it ſelf he told more lies than one; tho' he ſhould not have had that coarſe Complement from any of

us,

us, Had he but behav'd himself like a Scholar or a Gentleman.

6. It is false that Mr. *Francis Williams* ever said that Mr. *Robinson* exceeded the bounds of a Moderator; or abus'd Mr. *Russel* in misrepresenting him to the People. The whole that Mr. *Francis Williams* said was this when Mr. *John Williams* complain'd that Mr. *Robinson* exceeded his Bounds, he reply'd; if he did so, it was *Russel* compelling him to it. But as to Mr. *Robinson's* abusing *Russel*, he positively declares he never said or thought any such thing. Much more might be said under this head, but the unexpected news of the Death of Old Mr. *John Williams*, restrained our Pens; to God he is gone to give his account, and we shall drop softly over his grave.

7. It is a false Misrepresentation, that Mr. *Farrel* should acknowledg they gain'd any Credit to their cause by the Disputation, as appears by the following extract of a Letter from him.

'I Solemnly appeal to the great God, who best knows what 'were my words, that to the best of my Remembrance, I spake 'to Mr. *Williams* after this manner. Mr. *Williams*, I must tell 'you, and that not as mine own Sentiment only, but (I 'Believe I may speak it,) as the Sentiments of the rest of my 'Brethren, that whatever Credit (not your cause) but ye may 'have gain'd, is wholly owing unto you. To which Mr. *Williams* rep'y'd, don't Sir put that upon me. I Answer'd, I will 'speak it, for you argu'd with more Simplicity, and less Subtilty 'than *Russel*, and so were the fairer Disputant. These words 'thus in Civility spoken, had a plain Reference, not to the cause 'disputed, but Persons disputing; not to the strength of Argument 'but form and manner of arguing, (many things Mr. *Farrel* offers 'that shew this was his sense, which we think it needless to 'repeat, because the words thus Circumstanc'd carry their own 'Evidence with them,) he concludes his Letter thus—I now leave 'it to the Judgment of the Ingenuous, whether it can be fairly 'deduc'd from my words, that we were conscious of any Credit 'gain'd by them to their cause, or whether they are not conscious their cause was wounded, and interest sinking, when they 'readily catch at so vain a shadow, to support their Cause and 'Reputation. I will add no more, but that having perus'd the Narrative, find it so full of Fraud, Partiality, Falshood, and Misrepresentation; that this Instance may serve as a Specimen, if not 'of the whole, yet of the greatest part. Attested by *George Farrel*.

8. It is False, that the Advertisement in *the Post-Man* was ours. And we cannot but stand amaz'd at the Confidence of the man who dares say any thing. It was well Known to Old *Mr. John Williams*, before he left Gosport, that the Honourable *Colonel*

nel Gibſon ſent up that Advertiſement. He generouſly allow'd us to mention him as the Author of it, and hath given the annex'd Teſtimonial in Confirmation of it.

By Colonel *JOHN GIBSON*, Lieutenant Governour of *Portſmouth*, &c.

I do hereby Certify all whom it may any way concern, That the Advertiſement put in the Printed Paper commonly called, The Poſt-Man, *upon the 25th day of* February, *in relation to the Debate betwixt the Presbyterians and Anabaptiſts, held at the Presbyterian Meeting-houſe at* Portſmouth, *upon the 22d day of* February; *I ſay, the ſaid Advertiſement was inſerted, as above, by my Direction. I do alſo own, I was then, and am ſtill of the ſame Opinion as mentioned in the above-ſaid Advertiſement. Witneſs my Hand at* Portſmouth, June *9th.* 1699.

J. GIBSON.

This we are well aſſur'd Dr. *Ruſſel* knew, as being told ſo, by ſome of Mr. *Chandlers* Friends at the *Coffee-Houſe* in *Alderſgate-ſtreet*: when he gave the Honourable Lieutenant Governour ſuch Scurrilous Names, as we will not foul our Paper with. Notwithſtanding this, this Man hath the Impudence, to dedicate his falſe Narrative to him; Indeed with a Diminutive Title as if he were not Lieutenant Governour, Receiving an Immediate Commiſſion from the King, but only deputy Governour, Deputed by *Major* General *Earl*.

This he ſhould have enquir'd into, before he had dedicated his Book to him. This Noble Gentleman is aſperſ'd and ridicul'd as one of our unthinking admirers Nar. pag. 7. and a ſquirter out of Fooliſh Advertiſments, words that need no other Invective than the bare Relation, Pag. 10. what he adds further, that we would not give him the Civil Title of *Dr.* that he took his degree at *Cambidg*, admitted as a Member of that

Ho

Honourable Senate, and that not *Ex gratia*; is partly false. That he was created a *Mandamus Dr.* by *King James* in 1688. we understand, and with how great a Price this Tool bought that priviledg, we leave the World to Judg. But what he means by a Senate at *Cambridg*, is beyond our understanding. That he was not regularly chosen as one well furnish'd with the Learned Qualifications requir'd, his Ignorance in *Greek* we think to be a sufficient Evidence. We could also inform him to whom he apply'd himself for the better understanding of the Latine Tongue. That he also kept a *Coffee-House* in *Bartholomew-Close*, is well known to the Neighbourhood there. But supposing he he had been a Regular *Dr.* in Physic, as he stiles himself, this may no more qualify him for a Divinity Disputation than being a Coffeeman. So that why he should insist on his Title, in this case, we know not.

Here we shall also take notice of another Falshood, that this bold Gentleman hath Publish'd amongst and by his Friends in *London*. Tho' he have not adventur'd it into his Narrative; one of us hath been assur'd by a Person that had it, from the Mouth of an Anabaptist of considerable note in *London*, that *Dr. Russel*, to put it out of doubt, that he and his Friends had carry'd the day at *Portsmouth*, added, the Bishop of *Salisbury* had received a Letter from *Colonel Gibson*, wherein he applauded their *i. e.* the Anabaptist's performance. That such a report hath spread abroad we are well assur'd. But that it is most Egregiously false, that Right Reverend Person whose name he hath made use of, hath given us leave to assure the World. He doth indeed own he had a Letter from *Colonel Gibson*, his near Kinsman, Relating to the Disputation. But to a purpose quite opposite to what this falsifier reports; and adds, that not only the Letter he Receiv'd, but one directed to the *Ld. A. B.* of *Canterbury*, did Represent the disputation as much to our advantage as could be desir'd.

To this sense his Lordship was pleas'd to express himself to Mr. *Robinson* our Moderator, (who waited on him on this occasion) and Generously allow'd us to make use of his Name, for the undeceiving the World in this matter.

3. It is false, what he intimates pr. pag. 11. that when we were pinch'd upon an Argument, we made a Noise and Clamour that hindred the People from hearing what was said. Whereas all that were present, we doubt not, well Remember, the first disturbance we had of that kind, was that mention'd in the Narrative, pag. 35. when the Anabaptists (upon the mention of our Saviour, as an Instance of the Child of a Believer, not Baptiz'd till adult) rudely enough set up a shout.

And

And Mr. *Webber* Ignorantly cry'd, 'Tis done! 'Tis done! Tho' the Triumph was but ſhort liv'd, for ſo ſoon as Mr. *Leigh* reply'd to the Inſtance, the Body of the People return'd 'em their Civility, and ſet up another ſhout at them. Beſides which, there was no further Noiſe or Interruption of that Nature, till that rude Compariſon of Children and Beaſts of the Feild, of which more afterwards. The laſt Interruption was when *Ruſſel* would have put us off with a bundle of Humane Teſtimonys, inſtead of proof, and we had once and again proteſted againſt them, and given our Reaſons *viz.* that we had not the Authors at hand, to try the truth of his Quotations; beſides that ſhould they have ſaid what he would have them, their Teſtimony would not neceſſarily Engage our aſſent, they being but fallible men. When after this he yet would trouble us with his Impertinent long Quotations, the People refus'd to hear him, and continu'd to hiſs till he gave over reading; but what was ſaid at the cloſing up of that head by us, doth ſufficiently Manifeſt no Human Teſtimony can pinch us: It was the Ridiculous weakneſs and not the force of the Argument couch'd in his Teſtimonies that occaſion'd that noiſe. And if there was any thing in it, that was a grievance to him; Let him thank his Anabaptiſt Friends that gave the firſt Exampl'e.

10. It is falſe, that Mr. *Fox* was dip'd by Mr. *Williams*'s advice, Who was not then in the Country, nor did Mr. *Earle* know him. That it was done by Mr. *Chandlers* advice, is alſo falſe; for he was then at *London*. But that none of us would refuſe to dip a Perſon in ſuch a caſe, is true. We never pleaded againſt dipping as one way, but as the only way; not againſt its Lawfulneſs, but Neceſſity. So that this Inſtance is brought in to no purpoſe; and Brother *Duke* ſhould have inform'd himſelf better in the Circumſtances of this ſtory, before he had convey'd it to *London*. Nay he was dip'd not at *Goſport* but *Havant*.

We ſhall purpoſely wave the Falſhoods in the Narrative it ſelf, becauſe our own account doth ſufficiently manifeſt them. We ſhall only add that the Concluſion of the *Book* is as falſe as the reſt. For he ſays *p.* 59, 60. *That God was pleas'd to make the hearing of the diſpute, of ſuch uſe to ſeveral Perſons; That they were fully convinc'd* —— *and did in few days after, ſubmit themſelves to be dip'd in Water*; whereas we can hear of no unprejudiced Perſons, Who were any way inclin'd towards Anabaptiſm, by any thing that was offer'd in the Diſputation. And we challenge them to Name us one Perſon ſo convinc'd. Thoſe that were fix'd in their Prejudices, might perhaps take their weak Arguments and Triflings Anſwers for a ſufficient Confutation

of Infant Baptism: But we provoke them to Name one unprejudic'd Person that did so. And do offer, for one such Person so nam'd by them, We will, if they demand it, tell them the Names of several who did strongly incline to Anabaptism before, who by that Disputation were set right and fully satisfy'd, that the Anabaptist cause doth rest on weak Unscriptural Principles, how loudly soever they pretend to Scripture.

CHAP. II.

HAving thus far manifested, how little Regard the Anabaptist *Dr.* had to Truth in his Narrative, this were enough to be offer'd by way of reply; nor need there any thing more to discredit an History, than to shew that it is false. But we shall so far condescend to the weakness of Injudicious Persons; as to animadvert also on the Trifling Impertinencies, his Narrative abounds with.

1. All the Arguments they offer'd were Trifling Cavils. The First was design'd to turn off the Opponency upon us. The 2d supposes what was never granted them, that the only Commission and universal directory for Baptism is contain'd in *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mar.* 16. 16. For indeed if this were Christs only Commission, then his Disciples did Baptize *Joh.* 4. 2. without his Commission; for this Command was not then deliver'd: again, if this Command were design'd as an universal directory, Then previous Examination, discourses of the Significancy and Obligation of this Sacrament, stated Prayer before and after, are besides the Commission. Nay, the Apostles did deviate from the Commission, when they Baptiz'd only in the Name of the Lord Jesus or of the Lord, *Acts* 10. *Ult.* 19. 5. this is therefore no other than extending the Commission to the Gentile World; supposing that the Practice of it both as to manner and Subjects was well known before, only then confined to the lost sheep of the House of *Israel*. So that Infants may be Baptiz'd if we can bring good proof for it out of the other parts of Holy Writ, tho it could not be prov'd from Christ's Command: For the whole Scripture is the will of Christ; and his will discern'd in this Matter, is his Commission. But supppoſing (not granting) this to be an universal directory, We distinguish'd between Disciples, that are compleat or Incompleat. Incompleat may be made by the Ministry of Men.

1. As by the Preaching of Men, Parents may be converted and constrain'd to give up all they have and are to God, and so their Infants thus consider'd in their Parents, they are remotely made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

2. They are immediately made Disciples by the Ministry of Men; by the Parents devoting them to God; and bringing them to his Ministers to be solemnly dedicated to him. *Dr. Russel*'s vain attempts to take off this distinction, may be taken notice of in the foregoing Narrative, to which we refer the reader, as also to observe the little Arguments they further us'd, and weak Answers they gave to our Arguments.

2. His Reflections in the time of the Disputation it self and what he hath added, are equally Trifling and Insignificant. For Instance.

1. What he insinuates p. 6. as if in effect we gave away our cause, because we refus'd (at that time) to give an Instance, where there was any thing recorded in Scripture, that did oblige us to Baptize Infants, whereas it then lay on them to prove the contrary: Our business (who were the Respondents) was to attend their proof, the time was not yet come for us to produce our own. It was agreed that they who had reflected on the Doctrine of Infant Baptism as false and wholly untrue; should prove that it was so. Yet this Trifler when he had undertaken to prove, that Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism, At the very first would have put it upon us to prove they were so, and would perswade the company we gave away our cause, unless we did as he directed. This was Doctor like Truly! And one would not grudge, (however he came by it) to give him the Title, who does so powerfully carry all before him. You have his whole sense in these few words. Gentlemen, if I prove that Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism, you will allow I perform what I have undertaken, pag. 5. now this I'll make so plain, you shall not be able to answer or evade the force of my Argument. Thus I argue; if they be the Subjects of Baptism, Mr. *Leigh*, Mr. *Chandler* or some Body else is able to prove it. But therefore they are not so: And now I have effectually done your business; for if you say you can prove it, let's hear it; if not, you give away your cause. To this sense doth this mighty Man of Logic Flourish at the entrance, and Wonderful Feats no doubt he thinks he hath done in it: But such Egregious Trifling is hardly found among any pretending to the least degree above common sense. And it was fitter to have been hiss'd out, than so soberly reply'd to as it was.

1. What! Do you prove that Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism, by putting us to prove that they are. Wonderful! this 'tis to be a *Dr.* and to know more than all the World besides.

For till this *Dr.* came upon the stage, these 2 things were always very differing (to make proof of a thing, and put another to prove the contrary.) This Gentleman undertook to prove p. 5. but (as if he repented of his rash undertaking) he very courteously invites us to change sides with him, and thereby free him of a burthen that was too heavy for him.

2. Nor is every thing untrue, the contrary to which we cannot prove true. We cannot prove that this Narrative, *Russel* ever was at *Cambridge*, or took his Degrees there; but would he have us therefore take the contrary for certain Truth? Yes, we must, according to his method. If one boldly assert against us, That he never was at *Cambridge*, we desire they would prove it before we give Credit to 'em. In his way they'll prove it too, and then we must needs grant it. Well, we wait only for the Proof. Thus it is. You cannot prove that he ever was at *Cambridge*, or took any Degree there. Therefore, behold, he was not. The strange Effects of Logick!

3. Nor if we can prove it, doth it follow we needs must? especially when he had undertaken the Opponency. We that stood upon our Defence (as Respondents) were only to attend to what they had to offer, and show the invalidity of it; but were by no Laws of Disputation, that ever yet were publish'd to the World, oblig'd to change sides with them and take the proving part on us. Tho' this we declare we were ready to do in due time: but it was no way fit to be done at the beginning of the Disputation, unless this Doughty *Dr.* had said in plain words (as he did in effect in his first Argument,) Gentlemen, I have undertaken more than I can do. And therefore tho' I cannot prove that Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism, I should take it kindly if you would please to prove the contrary.

4. And as to his pretence, that his Proposition was an Universal Negative; Therefore we were oblig'd by it to give our Instance: It is a great mistake, and contrary to all the uncontested Rules of Disputation, nor could any order possibly be observ'd, if it should be admitted. For how easy were it for an Opponent in any case, thus to oblige the Respondent to change places with him—which what confusion it would create, any one that hath an insight into these things, will easily imagine. That Rule hath therefore (as far as we can find) universally obtain'd.

Neuter

Neuter Disputantium alterius partes suscipiat, neque opponens in partem Respondentis involet, aut contra; And consequently a very Principal part of the work of a Moderatot lies, in keeping each within their proper Limits. *Regimen praesidis in eo consistit, ut diligenter attendat, utrum Opponens & Respondens suo officio fungantur necne: Si utrumque aut alterutrum ab Officio suo recedentem conspexerit, eum sui muneris admoneat, & intra limites contineat, ne extra oleas (uti dici Solet) evagentur.*

5. Nor will that known Rule *Negantis non est probare*, and *asserenti incumbit probatio*, mention'd by *Dr. Smith* at all avail our Anabaptist Champion: As indeed it never was intended by that Worthy Person to any such purpose, as he hath allow'd us to assure the World: and as did plainly enough appear to all the Judicious part of the Company, when he spoke those words: his design was (as the design of the Rule it self, at least when apply'd to Logical Disputations) that the Proof lies not on the Respondent, who only denies, or distinguishes upon his Adversary, but upon the Opponent, who is the Asserter, whether his Arguments run in an Affirmative or Negative Form. But thus much is more than sufficient to expose his ridiculous Trifling under that Head.

2. He next reflects upon Mr. *Chandler*, as if he was at a loss, so that Mr. *Leigh* and Mr. *Robinson* were forced *to help him out with their Distinctions and Equivocable Expressions*, page 11, Whereas, if Mr. *Leigh* did offer any Distinctions, 'twas what belong'd to him, as an appointed Disputant with Mr. *Chandler*: And that they spoke promiscuously, is owing to a Proposal made by the *Anabaptists*, that the Disputants might be allow'd it; which accordingly was agreed before we went to the place of Disputation. So that 'tis Ridiculous Trifling for him, from Mr. *Leigh*'s sometimes speaking, who was allow'd equal Liberty with Mr. *Chandler* himself, to infer *that Mr.* Chandler *was at a Loss, and Mr.* Leigh *fore'd to help him out*. And it is somewhat more than Trifling, and should be inserted among the Falshoods, what he asserts, p. 16. *That Mr.* Chandler *finding himself unable to answer, quitted the place of a Disputant, and Mr.* Leigh *desired to take it up, which was admitted upon condition*, &c. Whereas it was mov'd the Night before the Disputation, when *the Anabaptists* came in a Body to us at Mr. *Williams*'s House, *That we would admit the Principal and his Second to speak promiscuously*. The Reason given was, *Because Dr.* Russel, *or Mr.* John Williams, *had an Infirmity that sometimes disabled him from speaking for a considerable time together*. We took till the morning to consider of the Proposal, and then at the Hour and Place prefix'd we gave that Liberty to them, provided the same might be allow'd to us, which was con-

consented to. Upon which it was resolved on both sides, *That the Disputants should be allow'd to assist each other, as they saw occasion.* With what Face now can this man insinuate to the world, *That Mr.* Leigh, *in the midst of the Disputation begg'd leave to speak, and could not be admitted but upon Terms*: And all this only to set off that False Lie, *viz. That Mr.* Chandler *quitted the Place of a Disputant.*

But to return to what we were upon: *Mr.* Leigh *help'd out Mr. Chandler with his Distinctions.* We grant he was helpful to him, and was chosen for that purpose, and was not Mr. *Williams* also to the best of his skill helpful to *Dr. Russel*? But *Mr. Leigh* helped out *Mr.* Chandler, and *Mr. Williams* did his best to help out Dr. *Russel*, tho thro the badness of the Cause, he neither did, nor could help him out. But *Mr. Robinson* helpt too with his Distinctions. 'Tis false; and his own Narrative (as it happens) will manifest it to be so; for that Distinction there mention'd by *Mr. Robinson*, is there mentioned not as his own, but *Mr. Chandler*'s; and it was only mention'd to shew the no occasion he had to spend Time in proposing such frivolous Questions; a sufficient Answer to which he had already had from *Mr. Chandler.*

There only remains under this head, *Mr. Leighs* and *Mr. Robinsons* helping out *Mr. Chandler* with their Equivocable Expressions. But this (*Equivocable*) like the (*Senate at Cambridge,*) is a word of the Famous *Drs.* own coining, and therefore he best knows the meaning of it. Equivocal we have often heard of, but equivocable we know not what to make of, unless by this, added to the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Instances of his Learning, we be left to collect that (as he says) he was Created a *Dr* in the most proper Sense *Ex Inhabili Materia. Doctor ex non docto.* Yet if he intend Equivocal Expressions, tho he charge them upon us, they are his own peculiar Talent. Perhaps few *Jesuits* herein equal or exceed him at that sort of Weapon. If any thing said by us, was grievous to him, it was not that we us'd Equivocal Expressions of our own, but that we repeated and distinguish'd upon his.

3. How impertinently doth he Trifle, when he over-loaded his 3d Argument with a multitude of Propositions? Tho Mr. *Leigh* deny'd first, *That the Apostle* Paul *did never declare that Infant-Baptism is a Gospel Institution*: yet could he never have it prov'd. Suppose he did (which yet he neither did nor can) prove that *Paul* never declar'd it in his Writings, yet how will he ever prove that he never declar'd it at any time by word of mouth? which yet *if he assert*, he must prove. And how frivolously doth he afterwards talk of our having in our Custody

any

any such unwritten Tradition? We never did assert, the Apostle *Paul* did declare any such thing by word of mouth that is not written, only said, *he might do it*, and put this wonderful man to prove he did not. And how insufferably weak and trifling are all the Reflections he hath under this Head cast upon us! While this was the Sum of what was said to his *Minor* or Antecedent. But afterwards we deny'd also his *Major* or consequent; that unless *Paul* declar'd the Baptism of Infants, it was no part of the Counsel of God, which (by his own account) he never prov'd; nor is it indeed capable of proof, unless what *Paul* declar'd must stand instead of the whole Scripture to us. And tho the Apostle tells us, *he had not shunn'd to declare*, yet he never tells us that he had actually declar'd the whole Counsel of God, *Acts* 20. 27. οὐκ ὑπεστειλάμην. The word intimates he did not prevaricate with them, or fraudulently keep back any truth, that in the course of his Ministry among them, he had a call from God to deliver to them: He he did not do as *Peter* faultily did *Gal.* 2. 12. ὑπέστελλε, who with-drew, sought Subterfuges thro' a mean and Timorous Spirit, conceal'd the truth when it was most especially to be own'd by him; and for which the Apostle rebuk'd him *v.* 11. now (says he) I did not from any such mean or base Principle, suppress or hide from you, or misrepresent to you any part of the Mind of God; but have freely and boldly declar'd to you, so far as I had opportunity, and there was any occasion for it, the whole Counsel of God. Not that we can imagine the Apostle had any opportunity to declare the whole of what God had at any time, by any Messenger, reveal'd of his Counsel. Nor was there occasion he should spend his Time among them upon such Points with which they were well acquainted before; especially while he had himself immediate Revelations from Heaven to communicate to them. If therefore it could (as it never can) be prov'd that *Paul* never said a word of Infant Baptism to them, it would by no means follow that it is no part of the Counsel of God: but only, that it was no part of what was immediately reveal'd from Heaven to himself, nor any thing that he needed to insist upon among them, who might otherways and sufficiently be instructed about it. We might therefore (when we had deny'd the consequence) with just Reason say as p. 21. Suppose but not grant that *Paul* had not spoken a word of Infant Baptism, yet they cannot in the least advantage their cause by it. And so our Opposition stands good against that Argument; even as he himself doth represent the closing of it.

4. His Reflection upon us especially upon Mr. *Robinson*, for refusing to admit him to harrangue the People upon the words of

of the Commission is (if possible) yet more trifling. Was he not not allow'd to argue from the Commission? And was not that all that was fit to be allow'd him? Was he interrupted in reading the Text? What would the Man have! Why verily he wanted to illuminate us and our hearers with his Preachment upon the Text. Poor Ignorant Souls! He perhaps apprehended we could not understand the Commission without his help: In the presence of so many Ministers and particularly of him that had the right of the place; he might have had the Civility to have ask'd leave, or to have forborn till invited to it. Besides he knew our company came together, not to hear a Sermon especially from him, but to attend a Disputation: The man must by all means Preach and having nam'd a Text, he begins, *This Commission is very solemnly deliver'd, wherein our Lord tells us, that all power in Heaven and Earth is given to him, and by vertue of that Power.*—And here he takes it ill to be interrupted.—And we must be reflected on as *Lucifugæ Scripturarum*, Bats and Owls that are afraid of the Commission, and fly the light of the Scripture, because we would not suffer him to go on with his Impertinent Harangue: As if it was all one to refuse to hear a Text of Scripture read, to as hear his Comment upon it: How excessively doth this man dote on his own Labours!

5. How Egregiously doth he trifle p. 24. when because our Moderator would not suffer Mr. *Calvins* Authority to stand for an Argument, he Reflects as if he had no esteem for him. Whereas there are few Names since the Apostles days, for which he hath so great a Veneration. What! is it impossible, in this Dr's opinion, to have a Veneration for a Person, unless we take his, *ipse dixit*, and swallow down all he says without chewing. But doth Mr. *Calvin* any where say, That the whole of the Commission is expressed in *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mar.* 16. 16. And tho he say, *Infants are not expresly mention'd in this Command*, yet we are sure his Comment on the Place (which will best discover his Judgment) says, *That God includes Infants in speaking to their Parents*: and so that Baptism, when apply'd to Infants, is not separated from Faith and teaching. And this he speaks in opposition to the *Anabaptists*, who made a great noise against *Infant-Baptism*, upon this Pretence. See his own words, *Harm. Evang. in Mat.* 28. 19. *Verum quia docere prius jubet Christus, quam Baptizare; & tantum credentes ad Baptismum vult recipi, videtur non rite administrari Baptismus, nisi fides præcesserit: atq; hoc prætextu multum tumultuati sunt Anabaptista contra Pædo-Baptismum; Solutio tamen non difficilis est.* And so goes on to answer this Argument. Wherein he hath these Words, *Quæ olim Judæis data fuit promissio, Inter gentes quoq; vigeat hodie, necesse est. Ero Deus tuus & Seminis tui, Gen.* 17. 7. *Ba-*

ptis

vos qui fide in Ecclesiam Dei ingressi sunt, videmus cum sua sobole censeri in Christi membris, & in salutis Hereditatem simul vocari. Nec vero separatur hoc modo Baptismus a fide vel Doctrina, qua licet pueri Infantes nondum per ætatem percipiant Dei gratiam, Deus tamen eorum Parentes compellans ipsos etiam complectitur. If this Famous Dr. hath not yet attain'd so considerable a Proficiency in the *Latin* Tongue, as to construe this, there are many Worthy Doctors of the Colledge will assist him. Let the Judicious consider whether *Calvin*'s Judgment and this Gentleman's be the same concerning this Command; and what a vain Flourish it is to bring in *Calvin* on this occasion. What he soon after adds, *p.* 24. to reflect on Mr. *Robinson*, as interrupting him, is as little to the purpose. He that pretends to Learning, and needs to hear any more of an Hypothetical Syllogism, than the *Major*, or consequent, is none of *Solomon*'s wise men. 'Twas as well known to Mr. *Robinson* what would follow as to Dr. R. the Speaker. How is it then that he insinuates as if he answered a matter before he heard it?

6. As to what he says p. 30. about *Erasmus*'s skill about the Etymology of a *Greek* Word, 'tis most ridiculously impertinent. Mr. *Williams* had a little before, very honestly acknowledg'd, that for his part, he neither knew what belong'd to *Greek* or *Latine* and yet presently quotes *Erasmus* as reading the Commission. Go Teach all Nations, and when they have learn'd dip them. Mr. *Robinson* remembring what he had said before, admir'd to hear him quote *Erasmus*: and therefore ask'd him whether *Erasmus* ever wrote in English? Or how he knew that he so read the Commission? But there was not a word said by any one about *Erasmus*'s skill in the Etymology of a *Greek* word, but he must still be trifling.

7. The story of the *Eunuch* p. 31. is like all the rest; for Mr. *Leigh* said not that the *Eunuch* had Children, but if he had had one or more, they must not be look'd on as the Children of a *Pagan*: He consider'd him not as an *Eunuch* but as a Christian. Besides might he not have adopted ones? Nay, might he not have Children, and be afterwards made an *Eunuch*? Beside all this we will tell the *Dr.* what he never knew before, and what is better worth his Learning than Old Womens Fables. And that is, that the word סָרִיס is Equivalent to εὐνοῦχος, and signifys not only *Eunuchus eviratus*, but *Princeps, Minister regius*. Thus *Potiphar* is call'd an *Eunuch* or Officer of *Pharaoh*, tho' he had a Wife if not Children. *Gen.* 39. 1. So *Gen.* 40. 2. The chief Butler and Baker are call'd *Eunuchs* or Officers. *Jer.* 29. 2. The Nobles and Princes of *Judah* are call'd by this same Name in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, and it is not probable they were all *Evirati*. Words have a different Signification in differ-

ing Ages; and tho' this word bear an Infamous ſenſe in this Age, yet formerly it had a more Honourable Signification. It would be we think profane and grating to Chriſtian Ears, for any to call the ſweet Ordinance of ſinging Pſalms, by the Name of *Ballad* Singing, as this *Dr.* doth in his Animadverſions upon his Brother *Allen*'s Eſſay on that Subject. Tho' he Juſtify's himſelf from the Old Tranſlation that calls the Song of Songs, the *Ballad* of *Ballads*; he might as well ſay *Paul* was a Knave, becauſe the ſame Tranſlation calls him the Knave inſtead of Servant of Jeſus Chriſt. To apply this to our purpoſe, the word *Eunuch* tho' now us'd in an Infamous, was once us'd in an Honourable ſence, and the moſt Learned Critics tell us that this Noble Man had no ſuch Infamous Character, but was high Treaſurer or Chamberlain to Queen *Candace*. *A Lapide*, *Menochius*, *Lud. de Dieu in Loc.* So that all the *Dr.* here hath ſaid is nothing but vain babling: And methinks what he ſays of the *Turks Seraglio*, is too Luſcious for a man of his Gravity. But if ever he had been entred in that Academy, the World had never rung with ſuch ſcandalous Reports *Turpia dictu*, concerning him.

8. Another Trifle you find, *p.* 32. *That* them *cannot agree with Nations, becauſe them is Maſculine, and Nations Neuter*; but *Relativum cum Antecedente concordat genere, numero & Perſona.* Alas, poor Dr.! did you read this in your *Latin* or *Greek* Grammar? Not in your *Greek* certainly; for there you might have found ſomewhat better for the purpoſe. That by the Figure *Syntheſis quandoq; relativum ad intellectum ſeu ſenſum non ad vocem conformatur.* And you have a Scripture-Inſtance for it, *Gal.* 4. 19. Τεκνία μου ὃς πάλιν ὠδίνω. Nay, had you been able to read your *Greek* Teſtament you might have met with Inſtances as to this very word, *Acts* 15. 17. 21. 25. 46. 17, *Rev.* 2. 26. 27. 19. 15. in all which places ἅτινα agrees with ὃς and αὐτός. So that had we not a rule in the Grammar to this purpoſe, it would have been highly fit to have ſubſtituted one for this very occaſion, rather than all theſe Texts ſhould be accounted falſe *Greek*: and this we hope is a ſolid Anſwer worthy noting down, tho' the *Dr.* reciting it five leaves after forgot himſelf, and ſaid we had no ſuch Anſwer. But the *Dr.* hath recourſe to Mr. *Goſnold* for his Aſſiſtance, who tells him that the Antecedent muſt be not the Verb, as he ſaid in the diſpute, but the Noun μαθητας; but where is this to be found? It is not in the Text, unleſs the Verb be the Noun. But if the *Dr.* had been as well acquainted with his *Greek* Grammar, as with that Beloved Book of Mr. *Goſnolds*, he might have prevented our Trouble and the diſcovery of his own Ignorance.

To

'Tis as Ridiculous to abuse his dear Friend, and prefix false *Greek* as a Title to his Book, when at least in that Edition we have seen there is only a plain English Title, of the Doctrine of Baptisms; calling it Βαπτισμων διδαχης, but there he may think himself safe, in keeping to the letter of the Scripture, for the letters are the same, *Heb.* 6. 2. from whence the Title is taken. As the *Dr.* before could not distinguish between a Verb and a Noun, so here he is not so great a Critick as to distinguish between the Nominative case and Genitive, but enough of this stuff.

9. How Impertinently did he alledg. p. 35. *Constantine* the great, as a Scripture Instance of a Believers Child Baptiz'd at Grown Years? What *Dr.* skip 200 Years at once, when you are pinch'd! Sure this Nimble Man was a Merry-*Andrew* before he commenc'd, *Dr.* It was a Scripture instance we call'd for, and an Instance of one Born in the latter end of the 3*d* or Beginning of the 4*th* Century, is given. Besides, the Father of *Constantine* was a *Pagan*, and it can't be prov'd that his Mother *Helena* was a Christian in her Sons Infancy As to his Flourrish of the Fathers of the first Ages; we Remember not that it was mention'd in the Disputation, nor is it in any of the Copys; tho' we Remember the *Dr.* pretended that for the first 600 Years, Infants were admitted to Communion in the Lords Supper, upon which one of us reply'd; then by your own confession, they were Baptiz'd, otherwise the other Sacrament would not be administred to them; which Silenced the *Dr.* and we heard no more of the Fathers that day. But if the *Dr.* dare be so hardy, as to abide by the Testimony of the Fathers, we will Joyn Issue with him here, whensoever he pleases.

10. How Impertinently doth he Harangue, (by way of Apology chiefly) pag. 35. 36. 37, for his having set our Infants upon a level with brutes. But all that he can say, can never excuse that beastly Comparison. Nay, to make the matter worse, after he had thought of it again at *London*, where he drew up the greatest part of this Apology, as we suppose, for we had little of it at *Portsmouth*; Yet still he hath the Face, to challenge us to shew the Disparity if we can: As if it was his fix'd Opinion, that there is no difference between our Children and our Dogs. We must confess we said little to it, as thinking it rather deserv'd stripes than an Answer. And the Honourable *Colonel Gibson* did profess to us, (the day after the Disputation) that he was so offended at it, that he would thereupon have quitted the place, had not some Gentlemen near him Prevail'd with him to stay, telling him if he went off, there was Danger,

the provok'd Multitude would do him ſome miſcheif. And truly an higher affront cannot be put upon any Parent, than to make his Infants no better than Brutes. But he bears us in hand, he hath *a mighty eſteem for our Infants*, even a greater than we have, for he hath over and over given it as his Opinion, that they are all ſaved that Die in Infancy. Now the Infants of Believing Parents we find in the compaſs of a promiſe. *God will be their God and the God of their ſeed. Gen.* 17. 7. So far therefore we may ſafely go. But ſeeing God hath not told us, how he deals with the Infants of others, we dare not pretend to enter into his Secrets, or to tell what we do not know. 'Tis enough for us, that God will accept the dying Infants of ſuch as have ſincerely devoted 'em to him. And for others, they are not concern'd how God will deal with them. That Man can never be truly concern'd about the Salvation of his Child, that never was Solicitous about his own. But after all, what ſtrange kind of Salvation, what before unheard of Heaven hath this Gentleman diſcover'd for Creatures, between whom and beaſts there is no diſparity! What! No difference, no unlikeneſs at all! For we hope he may have Learning enough to know the Engliſh of *Diſparitas*. Well! (whatever this *Dr.* can ſatisfy himſelf with,) we do both for our ſelves and dear Babes, wait and pray for ſuch a Salvation and ſuch a Heaven, out of which are excluded all Dogs and Hogs, and all of beaſtly Capacities and Inclinations, whether you take the Word Brute in a Natural or Moral Senſe. Yet leſt this Man ſhould think his Retortion, as he calls it, unanſwerable, we add, there is a vaſt diſparity between Beaſts and the Youngeſt Infants. For (as was hinted in the time of the Diſputation,) (tho' this Narrative not only omits but denys it,) Suppoſing them utterly uncapable of the Dutys, yet no one can deny but they are capable of the Bleſſings and Priviledges of the Baptiſmal Covenant.

They are capable of being Pardon'd, Juſtify'd, Sanctify'd and Glorified, and is it ſo with Brutes? But further, Infants are capable of being oblig'd to the Dutys of the Covenant, tho' they be not in a preſent Capacity to diſcharge them. Thus the *Jewiſh* Infants by Circumciſion were oblig'd to the Dutys of that Covenant, tho' during their Infant ſtate they could not actually diſcharge them. If they had not been thus oblig'd how could they upon their after-forſaking God, be call'd Covenant Breakers, as we find they are *Ezek.* 16. 8. 59. and oft elſewhere. Their Circumciſion made them Debtors, brought them under obligation to the Law, *Gal.* 5. 3. Laſtly, Infants have a Fundamental and remote Capacity, to diſcharge the Dutys of the

the Covenant; tho' they have not an immediate Capacity for it. They have a Principle of Reason, tho' they have it not perhaps in present exercise: Now is there yet no disparity between them and Beasts? Tho' so soon as they have a being, they are capable of the Blessing of the Gospel Covenant; and as to the Duty of the Covenant which is all that remains to be consider'd in it, they have such a Reasonable understanding Nature, as doth remotely capacitate them for the discharge of these Duty, and that doth most nearly and immediately Capacitate them to come under Obligations thereto: So that Infants (as uncapable as any of ours,) have been all along (ever since there was a Sacrament appointed for that purpose,) Solemnly enter'd into Covenant with God, tho' we never find that any Brutes were.

11. What an Impertinent Trifler doth this Man shew himself again, pag. 37. when instead of proving that Dipping is the only way of Baptizing, He would have put us to prove that Sprinkling is the way. That 'tis not the only way we Grant; that it is not a Lawful way he can never prove. But the Question was not whether that was the way: But whether Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming was the only way? And when we held him to the proof of that, He knew not how to alter the Argument, so as to bring the words of the Question into the Conclusion of his *Syllogism*: We then perceiv'd him to be *Clericus in Libro*; and that, when put out of his Road, he was lost. However that he might seem to say somewhat he told the Company, *his Argument was an Induction*. It should be remembred, that he had lately been confounded by Mr. *Leigh*'s Induction: and many Reasons concur, to make it probable, that he scarce ever heard so much as the Name before. But with them that understood the thing as little as himself, a hard word would make it look as if he had somewhat to say. This therefore must be an Induction. But his Argument he brought being only level'd against one particular thing, (which the Nature of an Induction doth not admit,) Mr. *Chandler* told a pleasant story from the late Bishop of *Worcester*, of a Covey of Patridges which yet was but one. Adding, here we have as Wonderful a thing, *an Induction of one*. What he adds afterwards is what we suppose he may have Learn'd since his return to *London*, for we Remember nothing of it. Nor is it in any of the Copys, whether on our side or theirs.

12. His Argument from *Rom. 6. 4.* pag. 38. 39. is very Frivolous: Because we are said to be *Buried with Christ in Baptism*, therefore it must necessarily be by Dipping. This was distinctly Answer'd by Mr. *Chandler* in his Sermons: But because

because the main ſtreſs of the Anabaptiſts cauſe in this point lys upon it, We ſhall not ſatisfy our ſelves to have gravel'd them in the Diſputation, when we deny'd both parts of the Argument as they form'd it; neither of which they were able to prove: But for the help of ſuch as need it, Shall ſet this matter in a clear Light; In order to which let it be conſider'd,

1. It is one thing for us to be *Buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm*, and another thing for Baptiſm to repreſent a Burial. The former the Apoſtle ſays: The latter only Dr. *Ruſſel* and his Brethren. We are (as the Apoſtle largely Treats, *Rom.* 6. 3. 4. 5. 6.) *Baptiz'd into Chriſts Death, Burial, Reſurrection.* That is, we are ſolemnly enter'd into the Chriſtian Covenant, which is founded in, and ſecur'd by, the Death, Burial, and Reſurrection of our Lord: Which thereupon moſt ſtrongly obliges us to Die unto Sin, riſe to, and walk in, newneſs of Life: But where doth he ſay a Syllable to intimate that our Baptiſm muſt repreſent theſe things? Our Baptiſm is to oblige us hereto, and is accordingly urg'd by the Apoſtle, for that purpoſe, throughout this context: But we would beg any one to ſhew us any Intimation, that our Baptiſm is to repreſent theſe things.

2. And if Baptiſm muſt repreſent theſe things, it muſt repreſent all as well as any of them. There is at leaſt as great if not greater evidence from the Context, That *the Death of Chriſt, the manner and likeneſs of it*, as that *the manner of his Burial* ſhould be Repreſented in our Baptiſm. For beſides that we are ſaid to be Baptiz'd *into his Death*, *v.* 3. we are alſo ſaid to be *planted in the likeneſs of his Death*, *v.* 5. whereupon *v.* 6. it follows, *our Old Man is Crucify'd with him.* But we are no where ſaid to be planted in the likeneſs of his Burial. Now what is there in your Adminiſtration, that doth repreſent the likeneſs of Chriſts Death, his Crucifixion? By the ſame Reaſon that you would prove dipping neceſſary in Baptiſm, a Papiſt or any other Perſon may prove croſſing neceſſary too, and therefore the ſame Anſwer will Invalidate both: *i. e.* that neither of them are requir'd to be repreſented.

3. 'Tis as Trifling, what he adds pag. 39. where he ſays Mr. *Chandler* grants that Baptiſm doth ſignify a Burial and Reſurrection. Mr. *Chandler* only ſuppos'd, did not grant it: Beſides if he had granted it, it would not thence follow, that it muſt neceſſarily be by dipping. For,

1. In our way, by pouring water on the Face, we repreſent Chriſts Death; the pouring out of his Blood and Soul: His Burial; The Face, the Principal part of Man being put under water

water, or having water poured on it, as Earth is poured on a Dead Body: His Resurrection; When the Child is taken up and deliver'd again to its Parents or Offerers. This is a sufficient Allusion in Christian Sacraments, which are Commemorative of what is past; and there needs not a more exact Resemblance. Nay, it is as significant as breaking Bread, and pouring out Wine, to Represent the Sacrific'd Body and Blood of Christ.

2. If they will keep strictly to the Significancy of a Burial, the person to be Baptiz'd must not walk into the water, but be taken up by the Baptizer, and cast down into it. For indeed there is only this difference between our way and theirs: We Baptize the Face, and they Baptize the head and shoulders too: Unless the Person going down into the Water, may be said to baptize himself. And then there are more *Se-Baptists* among them than we ever understood before.

3. The Anabaptists in *Holland* are to sensible of the no necessity of Dipping, that the general way among them at *Amsterdam* is to baptize by pouring Water upon the Head. We need not send Dr. *Russel* cross the Seas (as he would us to the Turks Seraglio), but to a place better known, the *Amsterdam* Coffee-house, to enquire into the Truth of this. We would only here ask the Dr. these Two Civil Questions,

1. Whether he might not have spar'd all his *Dutch*? seeing *Doope* in that Language signifies only *to wash*, and is us'd when they only pour on Water?

2. Whether his Anabaptist Friends at *Amsterdam* do practice a Right Baptism? If not, whether he would Baptize them again, or exclude them from the Church of Christ, as he doth us in his Closing Prayer of which more *Anon*? If he owns their Baptism Lawfull, Then why such a Clamour and Noise about a Circumstance? If their way is Justifiable, so is ours.

13. How Egregiously doth he Trifle, when he tells us that εἰς when it is joyn'd with an Accusative case signifys *into*. All that we can know from thence, is (what we well knew before) that tho' this Man pretends to be a dignify'd *Dr*, yet he hath not the Learning of a Common School Boy. When 'tis joyn'd with an Accusative—Why pray *Dr*. what other case doth it any way admit? We had thought εἰς *Soli accusativo jungitur*, had been a Rule no one could have missed, that had but once cast his Eye on the Common Grammar? Well Sir: If you have any regard to your Reputation, we would advise you never more

more to pretend to *Greek*, and do not make too great a Noise about your degrees, it will but expose you to the greater contempt: You had better do as Mr. *Williams* did, own your Ignorance, and not Ambitiously gape after the Name and Honour of a Τις μεγας.

14. As to his Humane Testimonys, They are of little value with us, for the Reasons given in the Disputation: And it was an Evidence of the wretched weakness of his cause, that these must stand instead of an Argument with him. These Testimonys he hath chiefly borrow'd from *Danvers*, and how Imperfectly and lamely they are quoted may be seen in Mr. *Wills* and Mr. *Baxters* Answers to him. So that to waste time and Paper about them is but *actum agere*: We shall therefore only put these following querys to him.

1. Will you stand by the Authority of these Men in other Matters? If not, why would you have us in this?

2. Do any of these say that to wash is not the New Testament sense of the word Baptize? Or do any Answer those places we brought? Or prove us in the wrong? Or how many places can any bring where it necessarily signifys to dip? We take not Mens Opinions upon Trust, but Trial.

3. How few are there of those Learned Authors, who have not adher'd to that in *Mat.* 12. 7. *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*, To Justify their Baptizing with a little Water in these Cold Countreys?

4. Will not the Opinion and Practice of your Brethren in *Holland*, argue as strongly against you, as the Opinions of these Men, (had their Practice been dipping also) do against us?

5. Will not the Opinion and Practice of so many Thousand Men, great for Learning and Piety at this day, argue more strongly for us; than these Mens Opinions only, without their Practice do against us?

15. We have another Trifle pag. 45. They had pleaded *Philip* and the *Eunuch* went both down into the Water. It had been reply'd that the word only signify'd they went down to the Water. But Mr. *John Williams* ventures upon a *Greek* Criticism, and tells us, he was inform'd there were 2 differing words in the *Greek* Text, where 'tis said *v.* 36. they came unto a certain Water, and *v.* 38. they went into. This *Dr. Russel* confirm'd and thereupon, (as they represent the Matter,) Mr. *Leigh* confess'd. There is a word for you. 'Tis well we understand a little Latine: Otherwise this Man would quite Silence us. But

so

to the Point: who ever told them there were 2 differing words in the *Greek*, told them true. And we are very ready to conceſs, or (as we would chuſe to ſpeak, conſent and yeild to Truth. The words are εἰς and ἐπί; and the true reading of *v.* 36th is, *As they went on their way, they came by, near to, or over againſt, a certain Water*: ἐπί, with an Accuſative, well admits ſuch a reading. And *v.* 38. they went both down out of the Chariot *unto* this Water. How well do theſe 2 verſes Anſwer each other? and where's the difficulty this wonderful Critic hath left upon us? *But, What need of going down to the Water, unleſs he were to be dip'd? A little might have been brought up into the Chariot if Sprinkling would have ſerv'd the turn.* In anſwer to which we ſay.

1. His going down to, or into the Water, doth no more prove that the *Eunuch* was dip'd, than that *Philip* was; for both went down.

2. 'Tis Improbable he was dip'd, being then on a Journey, and having no cloths to change.

And if you ſtill ask why they went down?

3. 'Tis not certain, they were provided with a veſſel to fetch up Water in.

4. There was not convenient Room in the Chariot for the performance of the Action, and what was to attend it. 'Tis not to be doubted, but it was attended with Prayer: your ſelves, we hope, would not adminiſter Baptiſm without Prayer, before, or after, or both. But what Room could there be in a Chariot, for theſe two Perſons to place themſelves in a Praying poſture? It would neither admit them, (at leaſt if of the Modern form) to ſtand nor kneel without uneaſineſs—Which alone might be a ſufficient Reaſon, for their coming down out of the Chariot, if there were no other.

16. How he trifled about the *Hebrew* Bible, and how faſly he Repreſents that matter appears by our Narrative. Mr. *Ring* had given over writing long before this, and Mr. *Bows* and Mr. *Webber* were aſham'd of their *Goliah*, and therefore about this time baſely deſerted and left him alone. The true account in ſhort is this. Mr. *Chandler* told *Dr. Ruſſel* that *Baptizo* was ſo far from always ſignifying to dip, that *Bapto* it ſelf ſometimes ſignifys to wet or waſh; And mention'd that Text. *Dan.* 4. 33. *Nebuchadnezzar was wet with the dew of Heaven*, in the *Greek* it is ἐβάφη. To which *Ruſſel* reply'd the *Hebrew* is not טבל To which Mr. *Chandler* return'd the *Greek* word we were then

inquiring into. However, to try his skill in *Hebrew*, who had so shamefully falter'd in the *Greek*, he was ask'd what the *Hebrew* word was. He said, if he had an *Hebrew* Bible he could tell. Mr. *Chandler* handed his, being *Athias's* 2d *Edit. Amstel.* 1668. with the Books in *Latine* Letters, plac'd after the same order with other *Hebrew* Bibles. He could not find the place, but read *Gen.* 1. 1. which he also sadly Pronounced. Mr. *Chandler* return'd: Sir we come not hither, to inquire whether you can read *Hebrew*, but what the *Hebrew* word is in this place. Then Mr. *Robinson* folded down the place for him: On which he mutter'd something to himself, which his neareſt Neighbours could not hear; and said the word was not there. But he hath not told us to this day what the word is. *Hebrew* Bibles are all misplac'd with him; for we hear from good hands that at *Havering* in *Essex*, he was confounded with the same place, and could not find the Prophecy of *Daniel*. Now we would befriend him againſt he Engages in the next Hackny Prize, and inform him of a great Secret; That *Daniel* is mostly *Chaldee* and the word there is not *Tabal* but *Zavang* צבע, a word of the same Import. And this Mr. *Chandler* underſtood, not before he was Born, but before the Creation of *Dr. Russel.*

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

BY this time it appears how unregardable both this pretended Narrative is, and it's pretended Author. A Pamphlet ſtuff'd with ſuch Notorious Falſhoods, and where it happens to ſpeak Truth, trifling ſo Egregiouſly, with what contempt doth it deſerve to be Treated by the World? But there is yet one thing further, that may help to diſcover the man, and that is the *Narrow* and uncharitable *Principles*, that have drop'd from him; and theſe we ſhall briefly animadvert upon.

1. In the very firſt page of the Narrative, Speaking of Mr. *Chandler's Thurſday* Lectures at *Portſmouth*, he tells you they were manag'd, ſo as was to the *Grief of ſuch as truly Fear God in thoſe parts*. Why! What was the Offence? He tells you it was given out, that Mr. *Chandler* would not only prove Infant Baptiſm from Scripture; but alſo furniſh his hearers with Arguments to defend their Practice. Why! We cannot Imagine how this ſhould grieve any that truly Fear God. To have a truth prov'd, a truth about which ſo many good Men differ, to have it clear'd from Scripture Teſtimony, to have the Oracles of God unfolded about it: 'Tis ſtrange this ſhould be grievous to any: Yes (ſays he) *It was to the Grief of them that truly Fear God in thoſe parts*. We are at a loſs to know the Reaſon why it ſhould be grievous to any ſuch, and here he will not help us out. However (ſay we,) was it to the grief of ſuch as were perſwaded of this Truth? Were they griev'd to have it clear'd up and be furniſh'd with Arguments for the defence of it? This can't be his meaning. Every one is pleas'd to ſee what he believes to be the truth, ſet in a clear Light—thoſe that were for the Baptiſm of Infants could not be griev'd at it: No, that he doth not ſay, but thoſe that *Fear God, that truly Fear him*, were grieved at it. So that (with him) none that are for Infant Baptiſm in thoſe parts will be allowed truly to Fear God. Not one beſides the poor Baptiſts, as he calls them, pag. 2. here's Charity with a Witneſs! All the Regular Members of the conforming and non-conforming Congregations, are cenſur'd as deſtitute of the true Fear of

God? Pray *Dr.* your Reason for this? Will you condemn us and not tell us why? What is there in the notion of Infant Baptism that is inconsistent with the Fear of God? Why may not a Person be of Opinion, that he ought with the greatest seriousness to devote and consecrate his Children to God; and enter them by Baptism into his Covenant, and bring them under early bonds to him, and yet for all this *truly Fear God?* Nay the rather do it, because he truly Fears God?

2. That he may shew it is not an unwary Expression, but his deliberate Judgment; He doth in the very last Paragraph of his Pamphlet lay the same stress on the Point of *Dipping*. His concluding Prayer is, that as God had made the hearing of the dispute of such use to several Persons, that they were fully convinc'd, and did a few days after submit to be dipt—*So* it may be of like use to many others in the Reading—That so there may be *added to the Church such as shall be sav'd.* Such a Prayer scarce ever before appear'd in Print, made up of falshood and uncharitableness. It is amazing to us that a man dare venture into the presence of God with a lie in his Mouth, and such uncharitableness in his Heart. The falshood we have animadverted upon, *Cap.* 1. Paragraph 10. The uncharitableness we are now to take notice of. He prays that as several by hearing, so many others by reading, may be convinced and Submit to be dipt; that so there may be added to the Church, such as shall be sav'd. What Apprehensions must this man have of those that never were dipt? Why they are not yet added to the Church. No not to the Anabaptistic Church! but we don't, but Multitudes are added to the Church of Christ, that never were dipt. Yet whatever we think, this charitable man will not allow they can otherwise than be added to the Church, and consequently no otherwise sav'd. What is his Religion? It consists in denying Infant Baptism, and asserting the Necessity of Dipping. If you agree with him in these, and accordingly submit to be dipt, you are (according to him so far as we can find,) added to the Church that shall be sav'd. No mention of Faith, Repentance, Obedience, inward purity; your being dipt in water upon profession, is with him instead of all these: But tho' you be Regenerate and Sanctify'd through out in body, Soul and Spirit, Walk humbly with God, and unblamably before Men; Yet if you were Baptiz'd only in your Infancy, or if when adult, not by dipping: There is no hope for you if this man were to be your Judge. But blessed be God we are to be try'd at an another Bar. And therefore with us it is a very small matter to be judg'd by him

or

or of *Mans day*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. knowing that *he that will judg us is the Lord. To whose righteous Judgment we appeal, and for which we wait in hope.*

But let this Mans notions of Religion be never so narrow and uncharitable, we declare *our Religion* is of no less compass than *Christianity* it self. All that hold the Essentials of Religion, we account to be of the same Religion with us: Tho' they differ from us in some inconsiderable matters. We will not be perswaded to look upon the English Episcopal, or the Foreign *Presbyterian*, The Congregational, or Anabaptists themselves, to be of a differing Religion from us; to be destitute of *the True Fear God*, or shut out of *Christs Church*, Religion consists in that which is *Common* to the Pious and Sober of all these Partys, and not in any thing that distinguisheth them from each other.—We abominate such a narrow strait-laced Principle, as would place Religion in being for or against Liturgies, for or against this or that form of Church-Government, for or against Infant Baptism, or this or that mode of Administration. These things are none of them great enough, to be the Terms of Eternal Life: The Final Sentence will not proceed upon them: We believe with St. *Peter that God is no Respecter of Persons, but in every Nation*, and among every party of Men, that hold to the head Christ Jesus: *He that Feareth God and worketh Righteousness, shall be accepted of him.* Acts 10. 34. 35. and with St. Paul: *The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but Righteousness and Peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, and he that in these things serves Christ is acceptable to God and approv'd among Men.* Whether he be for or against these things we have nam'd, or any of the like kind. *Rom.* 14. 17, 18. pl. 7/29.99. *FINIS.*

THE most material *Errata*, observ'd in a Review are *World* for *Word*, p. 17. l. 20. *Word* for *World*, p. 58. l. 15. *Sublects* for *Subjects*, p. 67. l. 31. which with any others of the like Nature, can create no difficulty to an intelligent Reader.

There are indeed several Letters dropt out in working, for which tho room is left, yet they disappear: but they may be easily supply'd. For instance: the ω is dropt in βαπτιζω, p. 17. and the σ in κοσμον, p. 49. and the Letter ν twice, a line or two after in the same Page, in των Ιωρδανην.

And if any who are fond either of the *Greek* Accents, or *Hebrew* Points, complain of their omission in those Original Words that here occur, they may charge it partly on the different inclination of the Corrector, and partly on the difficulty of bringing our common Printers to any exactness in what lies out of their usual Road. To the latter of which it is also to be ascrib'd, that so many of the *Hebrew* Letters are needlessly Dagesch'd.